

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NEDL TRANSFER



HN 1NP7 A

EMERSON

1487

Rules of the Boston Library,

FRANKLIN PLACE.

NOT more than THREE volumes shall be taken out at the same time, and no Books shall be permitted to be taken or used, but by the owner of a share, or his family.

For the first year after the admission of a Book, a fine of ten cents is incurred for each library day it may be kept beyond the time limited on the cover; and, after the first year, of five cents per library day, if detained beyond five weeks;—for abuse of Books, the value thereof when new. If any Book be lost, the same must be replaced by a similar volume, or by paying the current price of a new volume; if it be part of a sett, the remainder must be taken, paying the current price of a new sett.

THREE DOLLARS assessment must be paid previous to the delivery of *any Book*, after the annual meeting.

All Books must be returned to the Library, for inspection, on the Saturday previous to the annual meeting, which is always on the second Friday of May: the fine for non-compliance is one dollar.

Books must be called for by their numbers, and not by their titles.

The LIBRARY is opened every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday afternoons, from 3 to 6 in Summer, and 3 to 5 in Winter; also every Saturday forenoon, from 10 to 1 o'clock.

No person shall be allowed to go within the railing, or to take down any Book, without the written permission of two Trustees.

The present price of a share is 25 dollars.

ed
ue



**FATHER GAVAZZI'S
LIFE AND LECTURES.**

VALUABLE TESTIMONIALS

IN FAVOR OF THE GREAT PROTESTANT NOVEL

FROM FATHER GAVAZZI.

NEW YORK HOTEL, March 31, 1853.

To Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

GENTLEMEN,—I have received with much pleasure the valuable work by Miss Sinclair. I had already seen it; but it is a work which can never be too often read, or too highly appreciated. God grant that the efforts of all true Christians, in the mission of enlightening our brethren under the dominion of Jesuitism, may be successful. It is a work of great difficulty—as the enemies we have to combat are artful and all-powerful. But God is more powerful than they; and his inspiration will not be wanting to help us to destroy this dark and Satanic institution.

Imbued with these thoughts, I cannot but feel grateful to you for having called my attention to this most useful and valuable of works; and I trust that under the blessing of heaven this work will help to free the liberties of America from the yoke of Jesuitism.

I have the honor to be, your devoted servant,
ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI.

FROM THE REV. NICHOLAS MURRAY, D.D. (the celebrated "KIRWAN").

Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

ELIZABETHTOWN, Feb. 1, 1853.

GENTLEMEN,—Miss SINCLAIR has obtained for herself quite a reputation, and in the very best paths of literary pursuit. She writes to do good; and with the genial warmth and true sentiment of HANNAH MORE. A fitting sequel is *Beatrice* to her *Papist Legends and Bible Truths*, in which she terribly exposed the name-giving frivolity and vast absurdity of Romanism. In *Beatrice* she taxes all her energies, and the result is a work of deep interest and great power. Its object is to expose the deceptive arts of Popery and of the Jesuits; and this it does with great truthfulness and effect.

It cannot be otherwise than greatly useful in aiding to remove from the world the great curse of humanity—Popery. May it be read in every house and hamlet in America.

Truly yours, N. MURRAY.

FROM REV. THOS. E. BOND, D.D.,

Editor of the New York Christian Advocate and Journal.

Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

GENTLEMEN,—I have read *Beatrice* with great interest, and beg you to accept my thanks, as a Protestant, for the timely issue of a work so well calculated to expose the wiles of the most insidious and dangerous enemy of the Truth of God the world has ever known.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient and humble servant,

THOS. E. BOND, Sen.

FROM REV. GARDINER SPRING, D.D.,

Pastor of the Presbyterian Brick Church, New York.

Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

GENTS,—*Beatrice* is a good book, and worthy of its distinguished author. It is well written, and calculated, at the present time, to be useful. As an exhibition of the practical errors of the Roman Catholic Church it deserves a wide circulation. Portions of the work are also argumentative, and the argument is sound.

Yours respectfully, GARDINER SPRING.

FROM REV. SAMUEL SEABURY,

Rector of the Church of the Annunciation, New York.

To Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

GENTLEMEN,—I thank you for your copy of *Beatrice*, which I have read with pleasure. Although differing from the writer in some important matters, yet I approve of several features of the work, and particularly of its exposure of the doctrine of *blind obedience* as inculcated and practised in the Romish communion. To your question, whether you may use my name as sanctioning the publication of the work, I reply in the affirmative, and am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant, SAMUEL SEABURY.

Extract of a Letter from REV. JOSEPH H. PRICE, D.D.,

Rector of St. Stephen's Church.

To Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

GENTLEMEN,—I would be glad to see the book (*Beatrice*) extensively circulated.

Yours truly, JOSEPH H. PRICE

THE GREAT PROTESTANT NOVEL,
"BEATRICE,"

PUBLISHED BY DE WITT & DAVENPORT.

LETTER FROM FATHER GAVAZZI.

"NEW YORK HOTEL, *March 31, 1858.*

"To Messrs. DE WITT & DAVENPORT.

"GENTLEMEN,—I have received with much pleasure the valuable work by Miss Sinclair. I had already seen it; but it is a work which can never be too often read, or too highly appreciated. God grant that the efforts of all true Christians, in the mission of enlightening our brethren under the dominion of Jesuitism, may be successful. It is a work of great difficulty—as the enemies we have to combat are artful and all-powerful. But God is more powerful than they; and his inspiration will not be wanting to help us to destroy this dark and Satanic institution.

"Imbued with these thoughts, I cannot but feel grateful to you for having called my attention to this most useful and valuable of works; and I trust that under the blessing of heaven this work will help to free the liberties of America from the yoke of Jesuitism.

"I have the honor to be, your devoted servant,

"ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI."

°
FATHER GAVAZZI'S
LECTURES IN NEW YORK,
109 21
REPORTED IN FULL BY T. O. LELAND, PHONOGRAPHER;

ALSO, THE
LIFE OF FATHER GAVAZZI,
CORRECTED AND AUTHORIZED BY HIMSELF.

TOGETHER WITH
REPORTS OF HIS ADDRESSES IN ITALIAN,
To his Countrymen in New York.

TRANSLATED AND REVISED BY MADAME JULIE DE MARQUERITTES.

THIRD EDITION.

NEW YORK:
DE WITT AND DAVENPORT, PUBLISHERS,
160 & 162 NASSAU STREET.

KD 1487



ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858, by

DE WITT & DAVENPORT,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court, for the Southern District of New-York.

*W. H. Tinson, Printer and Stereotyper,
22 Spruce Street, New York.*

P R E F A C E.

THIS sketch of Father Gavazzi's life and career seemed to be called for from the interest excited by him, during his short stay in New York. It will likewise be necessary for those who have not followed his lectures, to explain the nature of his mission and the motives which actuate him.

Gavazzi, a man of liberal feelings and generous impulses, from his earliest years, deeply felt the state of bondage both social and political, in which the Italians were kept. Actuated by these feelings, he strove to discover the cause, and soon came to the conclusion, that the ignorance in which the people were kept, the bigotry and superstition in which they were encouraged, were the causes of their social and political debasement.

Profoundly versed in the various systems of the Church of Rome, Gavazzi soon discovered its falsehood, its utter want of principle, its culpable indulgence, its cowardly threats—he saw that through this deceitful code, miscalled religion, the people were ignorant, voluptuaries were maintained in a position to insure the temporal and despotic power of those who governed them, he knew that instead of seeking to civilize and enlighten, the Priests sought to mislead and enslave.

This conviction led Gavazzi to another, namely, that a religion entailing such consequences, could not be the religion of God; he studied the scriptures, he beheld the truth and he proclaimed it.

The regeneration of Italy is his object, to give the people confidence in themselves, in Heaven, and not in their priests, to instruct them, to civilize, that they may rise and claim the right of every individual, liberty of conscience and freedom of action. This is the aim of his crusade, nobler far than that crusade undertaken to free the holy sepulchre, for it is to free the souls of millions from

eternal bondage, and give the people their share in the prosperities of life, monopolized by a privileged class and specially by the dissolute clergy of Rome.

The publishers of the present Life of Gavazzi have received the following letter from the Father, and have made the corrections alluded to, which have been furnished them in manuscript. The present may therefore be considered as the most complete and authentic biography yet published of this extraordinary man.

"New York Hotel, April 12th, 1853.

"To MESSRS. DE WITT & DAVENPORT.

"GENTLEMEN:—I understand it is your intention to publish my life, as compiled by Campanella and Nicolini—for which I have given you authority. Although I ought to remain neutral in such an affair as this, you must allow me to rectify some errors which exist in these works—especially in that portion which concerns the recent troubles in Italy. Besides correcting these errors, it is my maxim that justice should be given to all, even to one's enemies; therefore it is that I send you these corrections—and also that the American public, whatever they may think of my life, may be assured that all the facts connected with it are correct, and that nothing in it is false.

"Your obedient servant,

"ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI."

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	9
CONTENTS	11
INTRODUCTION	13
LIFE OF FATHER GAVAZZI	17
LECTURES IN NEW YORK, &c.,	119
LECTURE I.—The Identity of Romanism and Paganism	131
LECTURE II.—The Jesuits	139
LECTURE III.—What is the Individual in the Romish System?	157
LECTURE IV.—The Infallibility of the Pope	173
LECTURE V.—Condition of the Nations under the Romish System	186
LECTURE VI.—The Blindness of Popery	199
LECTURE VII.—On Relics and Images	214
LECTURE VIII.—Pius IX.	226
LECTURE IX.—The Inquisition and the Madiai	243
LECTURE X.—The Present War of Popery against Protestantism	260
 DEMONSTRATION AT METROPOLITAN HALL.	
Address of Dr. Ferris	279
Address of Dr. Cox	290
Address to Father Gavazzi	295
Farewell Address of Father Gavazzi	297

INTRODUCTION.

THE Publishers of the present volume feel that they have a right to congratulate themselves on offering so interesting and valuable a work to the American public. The first edition of the "Life" of Father Gavazzi, which was published by itself, met a most favorable reception, and was sold in immense numbers, at all the Father's lectures, and by the trade throughout the country. This little memoir has been extended, and the events brought down to the present time, and the whole is now incorporated in the present volume, as a suitable introduction to the Lectures.

Besides the regular course of ten Lectures, this volume contains a brief sketch of the Addresses in the Italian language, made by Father Gavazzi to his countrymen in New York, every Sunday evening, during the course of his English lectures. The publishers had at first intended to insert these Italian lectures, *in extenso*; but they discovered that this would occupy too much room, and would bring the price of the work beyond the point at which they had decided upon as being most favorable to a wide and unrestricted circulation.

The sketches of these Addresses, which we furnish, present all their main features—while the regular Course, in English, are a well-considered digest of the whole body of facts, observations, arguments, and conclusions, upon which the reverend Father founds his mission.

But it would be unjust to ourselves if we should omit the confession, that the report and publication of these Lectures has been a work of uncommon difficulty. In the first place, the reverend Father, who is a natural child of eloquence, sometimes forgets, in the impassioned portions of an address, that he is speaking in a foreign language, which often fails him at the very crisis, and compels him to resort to gesticulation and silent but expressive face-workings, in order to communicate even the general form of his idea. Of course, all this it is impossible to report—and sometimes the mere words alone would convey no idea whatever to the American reader. Then, of course, those inexplicable and detestable irregularities which make the English language a sort of grammatical chaos, could not possibly be conquered by the reverend Father; and his English, as all who have heard him will admit, was sometimes understood with great difficulty. Our Mr. Leland—the most accurate and faithful of phonographers—was at first in dismay, and about to abandon in despair the task of reporting the Lectures. Still—the Father kept no notes, and avowed the utter impossibility of his writing out his Lectures. But we had undertaken the task, and did not mean to be driven from it by any ordinary difficulty. A lady, perfectly familiar with both the English and Italian languages, and who, by a long residence in Italy had acquired a perfect knowledge of all the facts, places,

and circumstances alluded to by the lecturer, was induced to become the amanuensis of the phonographer. Thus, the Lectures were written out entirely by her, from the dictation of the phonographer, who preserved the exact words and sounds uttered by the reverend father. From these, which of themselves would have been sometimes unintelligible, a report of the Lectures has been constructed which, it is believed, does justice to the ideas and arguments of the reverend Father, without sacrificing anything that was novel or characteristic in his style.

The Father was himself fully aware of the great difficulty of reporting his Lectures fairly, and thus giving the public a correct representation of his ideas and arguments. The object to which he has devoted his life, is one of the noblest and most important that can inspire ambition; and it was of the first consequence that there should exist some means of presenting his thoughts and ideas, without perversion or mutilation. In the brief and hasty sketches of his Lectures in the morning papers, this object was not always attained; and sometimes these sketches were so far from conveying the real meaning of the Father, that, as will be seen, he himself alluded to the matter, disclaimed the newspaper reports, and requested the public who did not hear him, to wait until a correct report of his Lectures should appear. We have already mentioned the pains we have taken to make this work worthy of the occasion; and, although from the very nature of the case, absolute literal accuracy may not have been at all times possible, yet we are quite certain that these pages present, in all essential particulars, the ideas, the facts, the arguments, and the conclu-

sions of Father Gavazzi himself, upon the momentous questions which form the topics of his Lectures.

Had the Father been one of those ordinary characters whose profoundest convictions never excite their possessor to enthusiasm, a better way, perhaps, would have been to write the Lectures in Italian, then translate them into English, and so read them to the audience. But Father Gavazzi is wholly incapable of so mechanical, so ignoble, a process as this. He is a true orator; and, carried away by his subject, himself, and the occasion, it is impossible for him to confine himself to a part, conned and learnt by rote, like an actor. The secret of the power of eloquence is in the sincerity and earnestness of the speaker; and it is almost impossible to associate the idea of sincerity and earnestness with the cold reading of a cold manuscript. No—although these Lectures, as they were extemporized by the speaker, laboring under an inadequate knowledge of our language, and frequently baulked in the middle of a sentence, for want of a word—although these Lectures, notwithstanding all the pains and care expended upon them, may still be here and there imperfect, they will be more effective than the most carefully studied treatise.

A few words respecting the mission of Father Gavazzi, especially his visit to America, will not here be out of place. The following is translated from a notice in Italian:

“Father Gavazzi’s mission is to preach a crusade against the power of the Pope, because Popery is inimical to the liberty of the people; therefore his mission is political rather than religious; therefore this courageous and fervent missionary deserves our respect and admiration for the unflinching

daring with which he throws down the gauntlet to this all-powerful enemy of all civil and religious freedom—Popery.

“It is a difficult work; for the political influence of Rome is so mixed up with its religious power, that to attack the one seems like destroying the other. It is not to be hoped that he will completely succeed in his mission; but it will be a great step gained, and he will be essentially benefitting mankind should he only succeed in revealing the anti-liberal tendency of Popery, and the dangers which under its influence would threaten the Constitution of our flourishing Republic. ‘Beware,’ says Gavazzi, ‘the Papist Church, with slow and measured steps, without noise, without vain boasting, is every day encroaching; and so it will go on, till, being sure of its power and position, it will arise, throw off the mask, and everywhere proclaim its doctrines; then farewell to your Republic, farewell all political freedom, all liberty of conscience, farewell all individual security; farewell, in fact, to all those glorious privileges and institutions of this noble and magnanimous nation.’

“There is but one way to check its ever-increasing power—impoverish it. Let a law be passed forbidding priests or religious institutions to hold lands, or to inherit; impoverish the Church of Rome, and it dies; for to this sect, of all others, ‘riches are power.’

“Yet it must not be imagined that Gavazzi is either an apostate or a sceptic. He belongs not to the church of the Pope, but he has declared that he is neither a follower of Luther nor of Calvin, but simply a disciple of the Catholic Church founded by St. Peter, free from all the errors, lies, and abuses of the present Church of Rome.

“Whilst defending political liberty from the inroads of Popery and Jesuitism, Father Gavazzi seeks to efface the petty differences of dogma, or of ceremonial, and strives to enlist all the followers of Christ under one banner, bearing on it but one title, the proudest of all, that of Christians.”

In the Lectures of Father Gavazzi, here presented, the whole ground of Popery and its influence upon political freedom is ably reviewed. Gavazzi is the very apostle of freedom—for that he lives. It is evident that he has deeply and carefully studied the philosophy and practical working of our government, and that he deeply loves and venerates it. If, then, he sometimes appears to speak with too great severity of Popery, its evils, and its dangers, we must remember that his whole soul is engaged in this work, and that everything is to be forgiven for the sake of the intense love he entertains for our government and our institutions. May we only hope that his warnings do not come too late; and that, plunged in the excitement of business and ambition, our people will not allow the influence of his words to cease as his voice dies away upon the ear.

THE LIFE

OF

FATHER GAVAZZI.

THE family of Gavazzi may be said to belong to history. His paternal grandfather was born of Italian parents, in Portugal, and at an early age was nominated Vice-Chancellor of his adopted country. The illustrious career which seemed thus opened to him was destined, however, to be of very brief duration: his name was included in the list of the proscribed by the Marquis of Pombal, and, abandoning titles, wealth, and renown, he repaired to Bologna. Here his merits were speedily recognised, and the Senate raised him, with the title of Proconsul, to the highest dignity which can be conferred on a citizen. The maternal grandfather, Patuzzi, was president of the Court of Appeal in the same town: he was a man of singular, rather than vast attainments, of an incorruptible integrity, and known among his fellow citizens, as was Aristides of old, by the honoured appellation of the just. Inscribed on his tomb are to be seen the words "Uomo giusto"—an epitaph more glorious in its laconic simplicity than the longest record of warlike triumphs. Gavazzi's father filled successively the offices of judge in his native town, peacemagistrate at Forli, Professor of Law in the university of Bologna, and was moreover one of the chief.

advocates for the Papal States, and a bitter enemy of the Jesuits.

These family details have been given, not with any false idea of blazoning to the world Gavazzi's lineage, but rather to show that nobility of birth did not with him entail the necessity of supporting the cause of oppression and of opposing every social improvement. His generous spirit lightly threw off these trammels, and it is to himself rather than to ancestral accident that the lustre of his name is due.

The subject of this brief memoir was the second of twenty children. His remarkable talents, which displayed themselves at an early age, were sedulously cultivated by his father, and bore their fruit in timely season.

At the age of sixteen he took a step, the motive of which it is difficult to divine—he became a monk of the Barnabite order. How came it that he, a man of strong mind, of lofty and impatient spirit, of fervid passions, could voluntarily take caste with a race of weaklings, become a slave to prescribed ordinances, and subject himself to that monotonous ordeal from which the most vigorous intellects have scarce escaped unscathed? True it is that the Barnabites are somewhat more liberal in their views, and less rigorous in point of discipline than other monkish orders, but these modifications are necessarily of trivial effect where the system is inherently vicious. There is a terrible uniformity in the views of the Roman Catholic priesthood, however various its sects; and blind submission to superstitious dogmas—the subjection of reason to faith—still remain the lessons inculcated on its members. Especial pains are taken with the secular portion of the community, since they are most exposed to the temptation of freedom of thought. We repeat then, that it is difficult to conjecture what induced a man of Gavazzi's mould to become a priest. There are certain secrets which a man locks up in his own heart,

or reveals only to a chosen few who sacredly keep the trust reposed in them. Being unable then to assert aught positively upon this point, we at least deem it incumbent upon us to show, from extrinsic evidence, that the objects which determined his choice were lofty.

Let us digress for a moment to consider the heterogeneous elements which compose the Roman Catholic priesthood. It often happens that the priest comes from the lowest walks of life. His poor parents, stung by ambition and a superstitious pride, pinch and spare to give their son the necessary education; and after certain preparatory initiations, the victim of bigoted prejudice finds himself a priest, he scarce knows how or why. Frequently the motive is baser still. In place of ignorance, it is a mere monetary calculation: a priest's pay is sufficient to maintain his family, and the money laid out in his education is considered in the light of a profitable investment of capital. Sometimes again, moved by the same sordid motives, a family which has suffered reverses of fortune dedicates one of its number to the priesthood, in hopes of securing one of the splendid prizes (the scarlet hat or other lucrative honours) which this career offers, and thus regaining the influence of which circumstances have deprived it. A more dangerous element is to be found in those who, having been educated at the charitable charge of the bishops and other magnates, enter, from a necessary gratitude, the clerical profession. They become the blind instruments of their patron's will—spies, or, if need be, the ready executors of any iniquitous design. Charity is the cloak which covers a fiendish compact, whereby they are bound, body and soul, to those who reared them.

Here and there, from amidst tonsured priests, rises a patrician head: the sub-divided patrimony was insufficient to maintain family vain-glory: hence this strange apparition. Disappointed ambition, blighted

affections, or a morbid distaste for the world and its vanities, often drive men to this as a last resource.

There is in truth something so avowedly anomalous, so contrary to nature, in the position of a Roman Catholic priest, that when by some rare accident one of them rises from the crowd of his fellows, making himself conspicuous by the elevated freedom of his thoughts, by his power of mind or by the vastness of his learning, the question runs from mouth to mouth, "how became he a priest?" Assuredly not from choice : and vain conjectures are wasted in endeavouring to explain the curious problem. Far be it from us to deny that there do not exist some noble instances of men who, feeling the sacred nature of their mission, undertake the laborious duties which a conscientious spirit imposes upon them with a cheerfulness and abnegation which cannot be too highly praised. Renouncing, perhaps, not without many a weary sigh, the sweet pleasures of social life, they address themselves with courageous simplicity of heart to their task ; they till with unwearied zeal the most stubborn soils, and scattering with open hand the sacred seeds of truth that the fruits may be reaped by others, look for no reward save that arising from the consciousness of having benefited humanity. These are the true servants of God, and they shall not be forgotten in the day of reckoning.

If now we look at the points already touched upon in Gavazzi's character—his determined energy, freedom of thought, and the noble generosity of his nature ; if we review his laborious works, which have subsequently borne abundant fruit, and reflect that he sprung from a family in which wisdom and probity were hereditary virtues, it is with a full and pleasurable conviction of its truth that we assert his choice of the priestly function to have been untainted by motives of family aggrandizement, of superstition, or self-interest ; there was no place in that vigorous spirit for morbid sentiment,—the hypocrite and he

had nothing in common—and in adopting the career of priest he sought only to consummate a self-imposed sacrifice—that of denying all to himself the more largely to benefit his fellow men. His after life proved that he had not underrated his powers of self-immolation: hatred and persecution, punishments, every bitterness which the bigotry of the Roman priests and prelates could devise, served not to turn him from his purpose, but he held on his way, toiling bravely in behalf of others, and fulfilling that which he deemed to be his mission, with a generous devotion which esteemed obstacles but as incentives to renewed efforts.

Gavazzi had then entered upon a conventual life, and was subjected to the dreary discipline of the novitiate. Much valuable time was idly spent in the usual superstitious observances, while the hours of study were devoted to the folios of Roman Catholic divines, from whose pages are drawn the sophistical weapons by which maxims of more than dubious morality are to be supported and made good against heretical assailants. The Bible is rarely seen in the priest's hand, or, if it be used, the edition is one in which the text has been garbled and disfigured by Romish comments.

Through all this mass of impediments the keen intellect of Gavazzi cut its way. He advanced in knowledge with rapid strides, and so great had his literary attainments become in a few years, that at the age of twenty he was selected to fill the professorial chair of rhetoric and belles-lettres in the public College of Caravaggio, at Naples. It was a strange sight to see this man, surrounded by pupils of nearly equal years, listening with a veneration paid generally to old age alone, to the lessons of wisdom which fell from his youthful lips; to see him confidently accepted as their guide to all that is great and sublime in the regions of literature and art, and recognized as the æsthetic judge, whose decisions were final. That it required

not only talents of a very high order, but also infinite tact, adequately to fill this post, must be obvious on reflection. A young man instructing youth—the teacher and the learner almost on a par as regards age—yet was severity so tempered by discretion, and friendship so divided from familiarity, that the love and respect alike of his scholars were gained by Gavazzi. He thus gave indications at that early age of that influence over his fellow-men, which in his subsequent career developed itself in so extraordinary a manner, until at length it became the moving cause of a revolution as generous in its objects as it was unfortunate in its issue.

The time now approached when he was compelled to repair to Arpino, for ordination, and so well had he succeeded in winning the affections of all during his stay at Naples, that his departure was a signal for a general sorrow: the young felt that they had lost a father; those of riper age a brother; none had not lost a friend.

At Arpino, it is the custom of those preparing for ordination to lead a life of scrupulous retirement, to pass their days in solitary meditation, and to prepare their mind by spiritual exercises for that life of denial to which those who become monks are bound by their vows. But this space, usually dedicated to quiet thought, oftener, however, to dull inactivity, was not left unfilled by Gavazzi. According to a known law in the priesthood, a monk has no will save that of his superiors; and in obedience to higher commands, Gavazzi went forth to preach in Terra di Lavoro and Calabria.

Young as he was, the might of his eloquence had already marked him out for the preacher's office, (a highly honoured function in the Church of Rome, whose aim ever is to seek power through the passions) and the result showed how well the selection had been made. Gavazzi's journey through Calabria was a veritable ovation. Attracted by the magic of his

oratory, the people flocked in crowds to hear a man who seemed to them inspired, and when he returned, at the expiration of a year, it was with the reputation of a consummate orator.

After being ordained, he went to Leghorn, and received a scholastic appointment as teacher of belles-lettres, but his stay in that town was short. He encountered the envy of rival professors, and having moreover incurred the suspicion of the authorities, was forced to quit the place.

And here let us pass in brief review the condition of those who undertake the instruction of youth in a despotic country. No profession is more arduous, or calls so often for the jealous interference of the powers that be : the cause is clear. A love of liberty and a detestation of tyranny are the first deductions which youth draws from the study of history, ancient and modern. We have little experience here of that enthusiastic temperament, of that spiritual exaltation, which, acting like a species of moral drunkenness upon the excited minds of men tyrannically governed, causes them to see in every instance of patriotic devotion narrated in the pages of the past some parallel with the present, which induces them to seek or form for themselves an opportunity of imitating the deeds of those heroes who, by a sublime self-sacrifice, gave up their lives to save their country. There is something contagious in the passionate fervour of youth : and the master kindling up afresh at the fire which himself has created, rises above the dull realities of life, forgets the dire necessities of subordination, and gives fluent utterance to doctrines which grate harshly on the ears of those who draw but one distinction between man and man, that of master and slave. Under a despotic government, the system of espionage is nowhere more strictly carried out than in the schools : spies are to be looked for among brother professors, nay, often among the pupils themselves : words are watched and reported, and an im-

prudent outburst of patriotic eloquence is followed by dismissal from office, if indeed the offence be not more severely punished. Such was the fate of Gavazzi at Leghorn. He was a man of too much note to escape suspicion : a most rigid surveillance was exercised over all that he said or did ; and it was intimated to him, shortly after his arrival, that he could no longer hold office as an instructor of youth under pain of incurring a high penalty. He accordingly left Leghorn, and, abandoning the teacher's post, resolved to dedicate himself henceforward entirely to public preaching. If his newly selected avocation gave him greater scope for the display of his powers, and the furtherance of his ends, it also brought with it fresh dangers, toils, and persecutions.

He had now chosen the chequered career of a man who goes forth to do battle for a great cause ;—if he had his hours of triumph, those of bitterness followed hard upon ; if he gained warm friends, he made also inveterate enemies ; he was adored as a hero by some, while others found no title too vile whereby to designate him.

The Jesuits showed themselves his most implacable foes, and unscrupulously employed every weapon which a fierce hatred could supply to crush him. But they had to deal with no ordinary opponent in Gavazzi. In vain they sought to dismay a man to whom fear was unknown ;—armed with the panoply of truth, he singly stood his ground like some brave warrior against a host of assailants, he fought a good fight, and, speaking or silent, still remained the victor. Banishment to him was but a change of place ; and with every new arena, new triumphs came.

The reader who is not versed in Italian customs, and the policy of the Roman Catholic Church, will have some difficulty in understanding how an open field is afforded to the preacher to communicate his sentiments to the people without let or hindrance. A word then on the position of those whom we may

style the sacred orators of Italy. The low status which Italy occupies in the scale of nations is chiefly due to those foolish and oppressive laws which weigh down all freedom, political or religious, and yet, by a curious inconsistency or oversight on the part of those who framed these tyrannical restrictions, an extraordinary degree of immunity is granted to those who, wearing the priest's robes, dedicate their talents to public preaching. The preacher-priest is least of all men exposed to authoritative interference, if he use but common prudence. If he attain but a modicum of oratorical renown, this slender fame becomes his safeguard; the people take up his cause; public opinion declares in his favour; a brief delay suffices to save him from persecution, and the law having made no provision to meet the case, even the dreaded implement of espionage falls powerless upon his protected head. It was the consciousness of these privileges which decided Gavazzi to launch himself in a career which enabled him to speak the language of truth without fear of molestation, if he were but moderately cautious in his choice of words.

Scarcely had he entered upon his pilgrimage, ere he was surrounded by eager crowds of listeners. The lessons which he preached to them were, to fear God, honour, virtue, and love their country. That his theme was ever the worship of that which is great and good, need scarce be told to those of our readers who have heard him speak in this country, but they have yet to learn what fruit followed his labours. If it be true that the greater the gathering of men, the greater is the harvest, then assuredly much was reaped. Multitudes flocked to hear him preach, but he cloyed them not with honeyed words; he tickled not their ears with the soft blandishments which draw a fashionable crowd to hear some popular preacher hold forth. No. Gavazzi's eloquence was of a different stamp—it was the manly eloquence of the servant of the Lord striving to inculcate upon his

hearers minds, in plain and forcible language, those "eternal truths that perish never." Piedmont was for ten years the principal theatre of his pious labours, and the towns of Asti, Alexandria, Vercelli, and Turin, were successively visited by him in the fulfilment of his mission. The seeds which he sowed fell upon no unfruitful soil ; none heard him without being edified, and the love and respect of all followed him whithersoever he went. He was twenty-five years of age, and already in the full tide of his reputation, when he commenced his daily preaching during the season of Lent at Piacenza, and he continued these sermons annually from this time forward during the remainder of his stay in Italy, visiting in their turn all the principal towns.

Friends and foes now alike increased around him, and among the latter the so-called followers of Jesus made themselves conspicuous by the rancour of their opposition. The sect of the Jesuits has ever taken the lead in that perpetual crusade against truth and justice, which is waged by the lovers of Satan and his works here below, and now, under the powerful protection of the Marquis de la Margherita, they directed their weapons against Gavazzi. During his ministry in Piedmont, Margherita succeeded in making his name a byword for all that is infamous : he was a man of gloomy, bigoted, and tyrannical temper, who, under the mask of asceticism, concealed a hatred of all improvement, social or moral : an intolerant retrogradist in his opinions, he sought to check all intellectual progress in others, and surrounding the throne of Charles Albert with Jesuitical co-adjutors, he succeeded in gaining paramount influence over the mind of that weak prince. Alike servant and master, deceiver and deceived, this blind follower of the tenets of Loyola put himself at the head of the movement against the apostle of freedom.

In the war of words which ensued, the themes chosen by Gavazzi, and his vigorous appeals to the under-

standing, stood out in advantageous contrast with the crafty and insidious doctrines taught by the Jesuitical preachers, whose constant aim is to enslave the will through the passions. Those seductive discourses addressed to the weak and worse portion of our nature ; the hollow cant about spiritual love in which too often the creature profanely supplants the Creator ; the dulcet tones and amorous whines of these hypocritical dissemblers ; were seen in their true colours of dangerous worthlessness, when confronted with the plain simplicity and startling energy, with which the man of God, in a language worthy the primitive fathers of the Church, proclaimed the saving truths of the Gospel. The audiences differed not more in character than did the effects produced upon them. Here, the passions are skilfully touched by pictures of a quintessential love in which the human element still predominates ; and the sobs, groans, and tears of excited women, show how artfully the preacher has addressed himself to his work ; there, a decorous and attentive silence reigns among the multitude, while they are bidden to forget man and raise their minds to God, that through Him their errors may be forgiven and their souls purified.

It was war to the knife then between Gavazzi and the Jesuits, and it is not difficult to see how the struggle was to end. Margherita was Minister of Foreign Affairs, and a partizan of the Order of St. Ignatius. Too much had been said, and said too well ; the truth had been too openly spoken ; the dark tenets of the sect too relentlessly exposed ; and above all, the bold advocate and assailant had been heard with too eager an attention not to render his stay on Piedmontese ground a source of fear and danger to his enemies.

Might conquered right ; and since where Gavazzi was, Margherita could not be, the Minister remained and the preacher was expelled. This banishment from Piedmont was the greatest triumph his enemies

could afford to him—it was to declare that violence alone could ensure them the victory.

Parma was chosen by him as his next resting-place ; and here he abode four years. His renown increased daily, and with it the demand for fresh exertions upon his part, to which he responded so nobly, that on many occasions he found himself compelled to preach ten times in one day. This appears almost incredible : to any other man—to one who possessed not his iron constitution, his indefatigable voice, and above all, that ardent zeal which sets at defiance all physical fatigue—the task had been impossible ; and even with all these accessories, so superhuman does its accomplishment appear, that were it not that irrefragable testimony of the fact can be adduced, we should have hesitated to record it in these pages. To appreciate duly the meritorious character of these wonderful exertions, it should be remembered that no vile motive of gain actuated him : it is the more needful to mention this, because it is not an uncommon custom with the secular priests in Italy to prostitute their talents to a base desire of lucre, making a mere speculation of their sacred profession. Such a disgrace cannot fall upon the convent priests, simply because in monastic life the individuality of the person is not recognized, and any benefit gained by a member accrues to the community at large. It could not be for fame simply that he toiled ; since that was already obtained, and secured upon an imperishable basis. He laboured solely to accomplish that mission to which he believed himself called ; to ameliorate the condition of his countrymen.

So long, however, as Gregory the Sixteenth occupied the Papal throne, it was not probable that a man of liberal and enlarged ideas would be permitted to pursue his career unmolested. New persecution and bitterness awaited Gavazzi. In a series of sermons which he preached at Bologna, patriotism and its virtues were unfortunately chosen as the theme. The

subject and the manner in which it was treated, alike displeased the suspicious Pontiff, and a command to discontinue the discourses, quickly thundered from the Vatican, and he was bidden to exercise his vocation for preaching in the central prison of Parma. The Governor gave him here every advantage to exercise fully his great mission, naming him Chaplain extraordinary to all denominations of prisoners. To these he came more as a friend and brother than as one in authority. In this abode of vice and darkness he found an audience composed of eight hundred persons—prisoners and galley slaves. Daily he addressed them in discourse, striving to touch these hearts of bronze, and to instil into them some notions of piety and religion. He was addressing men in whom habitual vice had well nigh extinguished every human sympathy; who cursed their chains, not as punishments, but as impediments to the committal of fresh crimes; assassins who bit in idle rage those hands which they could not imbrue in the blood of others—wretches, in whose mouths the most horrible imprecations were familiar as household words, and whose seared consciences had long ceased to feel aught of remorse, save when they failed in the accomplishment of some villanous design; and yet the magic of his eloquence availed him even here—these savages were spell-bound by that wondrous oratory; and, insensibly leading them on, he spoke in praise of virtue, honour and religion, of brotherly love and sweet Christian charity, until from admiration they passed on to conviction, and ere he left those dismal vaults, the divine ray of hope which entered with him had shed its beneficent influence upon minds as dark as the dungeons in which they were imprisoned, and in place of jarring blasphemies, might be heard voices in subdued tones speaking of repentance and the fear of the Lord.

In these dungeons are confined all sorts of criminals, .

of suspected people imprisoned by the police. It also includes the house of correction for young offenders, for vagabonds, so that in the course of a year there are no less than five thousand persons within its walls, of all ages and conditions, from the infant on the breast of its mother, to men in the last stage of existence, sinking under the weight of years and crime. Thus, Gavazzi's mission was, beyond measure, fatiguing, the prisoners having no confidence but in him—he was the only medium employed between them and the authorities—and this confidence, even of the most inveterate criminal, he had obtained by his frank and cordial manner. All the other chaplains were looked on as spies of the government, whilst Gavazzi they considered as a true and sympathizing friend. His duties, therefore, were both varied and arduous. Besides preaching the word of God, he instructed the ignorant, administered the last rites to the dying, he listened to their sorrows, he comforted and consoled them; and besides all this spiritual assistance he had to provide for their material comfort and wants, for the prisons were horribly managed, the food was wretched, the infirmary badly organized, and the comfort of the prisoners utterly neglected. Many he taught to read and write, and finally accompanied the condemned to the place of execution. He was never less than ten hours amongst the various cells of the prison, often to persuade them to come to the Holy Communion; at the great fête of Christianity, Easter Sunday, he would be the whole twenty-four hours with his beloved prisoners, taking only a slight refreshment, without leaving the walls of the prison.

Exonerated, therefore, from all the former accusations of hypocrisy or insincerity which it was thought the sight of so much misery would reveal, Gavazzi resumed his preaching to the Italians, and although he did not abandon or forget the many objects of his

care in the prisons, he dedicated himself with renewed energy to the promulgation of the truth amongst his countrymen.

He went to Perugia, where he preached with his usual success. In 1845 he delivered a powerful discourse at Ancona, and in one of those fiery outbursts of sacred zeal which characterize the man, he overstepped the limits assigned to him, and uttered some dangerous truths. The ire of Capellari and Lambruschini was aroused, and as the simple prohibition of speech seemed insufficient, he was removed to the College of the Novitiate of St. Severino, and there virtually imprisoned, as one who had been guilty of ribald and heretical attacks on the Church of Rome.

The place of his confinement had not been chosen undesignedly. Nowhere had the bigoted and pernicious doctrines of the Church of Rome more intolerant advocates—nowhere was their infringement visited with greater severity. A man of liberal ideas was looked upon as a monster of iniquity; and Gavazzi's advent among them was the signal for the pouring out of the phials of wrath. Every indignity which monkish malice could suggest was heaped upon his head; he was persecuted with the utmost rigour of conventual discipline, and for the space of twelve months his life was one of wretchedness and misery.

About this time an event occurred which diffused a feeling of joy throughout Italy, and at the same time brought hope and release to the imprisoned Barnabite. Gregory died, and a Pontificate, whose annals were marked with the usual characters of blood and persecution, ceased. Mastai was called to the Papal throne under the title of Pius the Ninth. The commencement of his reign was the prelude of sweet hopes for Italy. The name of Pius the Ninth passed from mouth to mouth, and was never mentioned save in terms of veneration and love. The nations of the earth echoed the cry of gratulation, and the tyrants trembled on their thrones on seeing the Pontifical throne filled by

a man who was said to be a lover of liberty. Italy hoped and despots feared.

Gavazzi shared in the general rejoicings. He thought he saw a future dawning for his country: he gave himself up to sweet hopes: it was through religion at last that liberty should be given to his country. It would be that peace and sacred liberty which flows from a divine source, and untainted by aught of license or corruption. In short, he too for a moment believed that it was in a Pope that Italy was to find a saviour—a short-sighted and short-lived faith not destined to be realized—a monstrous belief, in truth, that Popery could lead the way to freedom! This strange delusion seized upon Italy for the first and last time with the accession of Pius.

Gavazzi had lived on terms of familiar intercourse with the brothers of the newly-proclaimed Pontiff; and, through their interest, he was speedily released from his convent-prison, recalled to Rome, and taken into favour. He preached for the first time in the Eternal City in the church of Santa Maria degli Angioli. It was the anniversary of the election of Pius; and inspired by the brilliant hope that the day of freedom for his country was at hand, his language took a lofty tone which kindled a more than wonted enthusiasm in the breasts of his hearers.

It was at this juncture that the conspiracy of August broke out in Rome. The tempest commenced in Ferrara, and a horde of lawless ruffians spread terror and devastation throughout the country. Italy seemed lost—when a Heaven-inspired thought of the Pontiff's, whose mind had not yet succumbed to the deadly influence of the Vatican, saved Rome, saved Italy. He called into existence the National Guards, and, as at the word of enchantment, thousands upon thousands of men started up in terrible attitude, armed for the defence of their country. Fear seized upon the foe, and the tempest subsided as suddenly as it had arisen. It was on this occasion of

all others, that the weak, wavering character of the Pope revealed itself to Gavazzi. He, who had been the original champion of the cause of freedom, was to be the first to experience the dawning apostasy of the papal mind. He preached three sermons of thanksgiving, in the Church of St. Andrea delle Frate, to God that it had pleased Him in His infinite mercy to defeat the ends of the conspirators, and to deliver his country. He gave full scope to the thoughts which burned within his breast ; with the unsparing severity of truth, he laid bare the enormities of the past reign of Gregory ; he painted in vivid colours the butcheries which had stained that pontificate of blood ; he forgot the Pope and condemned the man. This was more than sufficient to displease Pius, who was only capable of enduring half-truths : rebuke and punishment followed, which were borne with meek resignation ; for in the sincerity of his heart, Gavazzi thought that he had perhaps allowed zeal to outrun discretion. He was forbidden to speak, and he remained silent. Gavazzi always acted loyally and honourably ; for, when the students came to him in a body, and asked him to address them, Gavazzi, still holding his allegiance to the Pope, who had forbidden his so doing, he refused to comply with their request. The students then repaired to the church, and at the very foot of the altar, asked the priest who was celebrating mass, to absolve him from this prohibition. This being granted, the students raised Gavazzi in their arms and carried him in triumph to the pulpit, whence he addressed them with all the eloquence and unction of the true Italian priest. As long as he recognized the authority of the Pope he never voluntarily transgressed it.

January came ; and in that memorable month a cry of horror and indignation was heard to rise through universal Italy. The Padua butchery had shown what Austria could do. Tyranny and oppression had invented a new art for discovering the rebel-

lions spirits and securing fresh victims. This was the modern system of provocation. There is something truly devilish in the idea of a calculated series of petty annoyances, practised with the end of exciting the rash and generous spirit of youth, until, stung with madness, the victim turns round upon the oppressor, and, forgetting the miserable distinction of master and slave, strikes a blow for dear liberty. The officers and common soldiers emulated one another in ingenious devices to exhaust the patience of the unhappy Italians. At each meeting in the street, some gesture of contempt, some insulting word signified to the citizen the estimation in which he was held. The last of indignities was not spared him; not only was he reviled but spat upon. Who cannot foresee the result? The students of Padua rose; and a day of fierce and desperate struggling ensued—a day long to be remembered in Italy, and which was but the prelude to that mighty shock briefly afterwards to be felt throughout the whole kingdom. Roused to desperation, unarmed youths threw themselves recklessly upon an armed soldiery; with naked hands they tore the murderous weapons from the assassin's grasp; a fell thirst of vengeance inspired beardless boys fearlessly to face the swords, guns, and bayonets of disciplined warriors; the victim disarmed and slew the tyrant with his own weapon; and heroic deeds were performed worthy the sacred cause of retributive justice; but alas! the contest was too unequal. Fresh troops, cavalry, and cannon were called out; an indiscriminate massacre ensued—houses were entered; helpless innocents, dragged from their hiding-places, were pitilessly slain, and after a few hours of butchery, the Austrians remained masters of the bloody day. The insurrection was crushed; but the Germans had been taught a lesson which they will not lightly forget: they learned what Italian valour, supported by a just cause, can do: they learned to fear the roused ire of an oppressed

people, and acquired a foretaste of that which was to befall them later.

News of the dreadful scene which had been enacted at Padua spread like wildfire through Italy. A yell of execration sounded through the land. Fathers and mothers trembled for their children; even those who had been the warmest supporters of the Austrian government shuddered at the atrocities which had been committed, and felt that their sons' lives lay at any moment at the mercy of tyrannical caprice. The students were at once recalled to their homes, and the university was closed.

Is it a subject then for wonder, that when in other cities, under the very eyes of the oppressors, the like was done, that in Rome too, where men had now tasted a little of the sweet air of liberty, a day should be set apart to celebrate the death of those who fell at Padua?

Shall we wonder that the Roman youth, and more especially its student youth, assembled to pray for peace to the souls of their murdered brethren—that Gavazzi assisted, by his presence, at the pious ceremony in the University Church? Shall we wonder that he, the man of note, was invited by universal acclaim, to speak the sentiments of all on that memorable and solemn occasion? and that he, the man of intrepid and generous soul, readily undertook the honourable, yet perilous task? Again we ask, is it a matter for wonder that, borne away by his feelings, the solemnity of the circumstance, and the enthusiasm of his excited auditory, he was unable to restrain the tide of impassioned extempore eloquence which rushed to his lips, and said things calculated to offend the sensitive ears of Romish priests and a would-be liberal Pope?

But we may be permitted to wonder that some excuse could not be found for him in the unprecedented nature of the circumstance, the unprepared address, the wild cravings which he had to satisfy, the moving

character of his theme ; it is with a justly indignant surprise that we learn that none of these extenuating circumstances seemed sufficient to cause the Pope to lean to the side of mercy, and exchange punishment for rebuke.

Gavazzi was condemned without show of justice : he was sent first to undergo the severe discipline of the convent of Polveriera, and shortly transferred thence, with an inquisitional mystery, to the Capuchin convent of Genzano.

A brief elucidation of this mystery will make known to the world the real character of Pius IX., a character which Gavazzi has ever considered entirely wanting in singleness of purpose, and incapable of good faith. Prince Gaetani, who was in some degree a favorite of the Pope, minister of police, and Governor of Rome, and also President of the University, went, in company with the too celebrated Padre Ventura, to Pius IX. ; and in the name of all the youth of Rome, asked the liberation of Gavazzi. This was in the beginning of February. Gavazzi, while in prison ; had received various deputations, and more than five thousand of the inhabitants of Rome had called on him. On the 2d of February, a grand serenade was in preparation, to be offered to him, by the students of the University, and of the *belli arti*.

Pius IX. was aware of the sympathy excited by Father Gavazzi, and thought to get rid of the whole affair by one of those strokes of diplomacy, so often employed in ecclesiastical policy. Accordingly, in the night of the first and second of February, two of his police presented themselves, in the name of Pius IX., with express orders to the Cardinal vicar at the convent of Polveriera, to transfer his prisoner to the convent of Genzano. Accordingly, he was placed in a carriage, in which were two more policemen, and conveyed to Genzano, which is twenty-five miles from Rome. The next day, a deputation of all the students in Rome, presented themselves at the convent

of Polveriera, with the intention of carrying him in triumph to the College of San Carlo ; but, to their great surprise and disappointment, they were told that Gavazzi had been taken, by order of the Pope, to another convent.

Although astonished and indignant, the students, still believing in the liberality of the Pope, and still willing to believe him guilty of weakness rather than deception, the youthful deputation forbore any demonstration of anger. They determined, however, to discover the prison to which their friend had been transferred. They therefore decided that, two by two, they should visit every convent in the city of Rome, as well as within thirty miles of its walls. For some days their researches were fruitless. At length the two who arrived at Genzano, found their beloved prisoner. Their companions, summoned by the successful pioneers, soon liberated Gavazzi, and restored him triumphantly.

At this crisis in his career a new epoch commenced for Europe—the epoch of revolutions.

France banished the dynasty of Orleans, and proclaimed the republic. Europe seemed paralyzed by the force and suddenness of the blow ; the people greeted the opportunity with a wild enthusiasm, and, following the example, the torch of liberty was brandished everywhere, and in a few days central Europe became the seat of constitutional government.

Hope dawned for Italy from a truly unexpected quarter. It came from Germany—from Vienna. The students of all nations who were assembled there, Germans, Hungarians, Italians, Poles, strove to further the great end of the regeneration of nations, and to their noble efforts the Austrian revolution is mainly due. The dynasty of Hapsburg which had resisted the shock of ages, trembled on its throne. The emperor, archdukes, princes, and ministers in the imperial palace heard with dismay threats of banishment, imprisonment, and death. In the extremity of

their fear they granted everything. Electoral franchise was promised, and a free constitution decreed—Metternich, fearing for his life, fled in haste—Italy soon knew what was passing at Vienna—cockades were mounted, the tricolor flags displayed, and the Italian banner unfurled—Venice and Lombardy drove out the enemy—capitulation on capitulation followed. But a few days had elapsed, and the whole of Lombardo-Venetia, save Verona and Mantua and the dependent fortresses, was free. The Germans withdrew in trembling haste to these fortified towns, as their sole place of refuge. Here too was Radetzky.

And again a cry arose throughout the land—a cry of brotherhood and love. Long-cherished hopes and desires assumed the garb of certainties, and national unity seemed attained. The various states hastened to send assistance to Lombardy and Venice, to meet the moment when Austria, waking from her surprise, should pour her hordes into Italy. Rome was not the last to respond to the call which bade each man join in the crusade against the eternal foe and oppressor of his native land.

The Pope yielded, with ill grace perhaps, to the demand of the people, but he was not yet quite a tyrant, and authorized voluntary levies throughout his states, whose number, added to the Roman volunteers, constituted a force of formidable magnitude. An army had arisen as if by magic. A multitude was in arms, burning with patriotic fire, and ready to shed the last drop of their blood in defence of their hearths and homes.

Gavazzi was one of the first to move in the great cause. He was the first man who paraded the streets of Rome with the emblematic colours pinned to his breast. Mindful, however, of his sacred calling, he chose the typical form of the cross,* and often in

* He still wears the cross in the national colors on his gown when he lectures.

the thickest of the fray, in days which followed, was this cross the sole defence of the man who exposed himself fearlessly in the cause of truth. It never quitted him from that time forward, and now with a pardonable pride he shows it as a trophy in the land of the stranger.

When the glorious news of the days of Milan reached Rome, he preached the crusade of deliverance—aid to the friends of liberty, and banishment to the common foe. At his stirring appeal, a valorous youth sprang to arms—none resisted this sovereign persuader of hearts. Students, mechanics, rich and poor, the noble and low-born, were banded together: nay, even fathers forgot the duties of home and family in this hour of their country's need, and ere two days had passed the troop of volunteers was on its march.

The arch-dissembler Pius feigned approval of the mission and its purpose. The troops were summoned to the Vatican; and there, men, arms and flags received the Papal benediction. A solemn blessing was invoked on the great work, and Gavazzi, as deemed most worthy of the high office, was nominated chaplain in chief. The Pontiff, in a private interview granted that same evening, empowered Gavazzi to act with supreme authority over the other chaplains, gave certain final instructions, and graciously accorded to him a special blessing for his new vocation. Never was better proof afforded of how incompatible are liberty and Popedom than in this interview. Gavazzi was given to understand that the passage of the Po was authorized solely with a view to recover for the holy see the district of Polesine. Hence it was not for liberty—it was not to free the land from tyranny and oppression—it was for no great national and disinterested end that this enterprise was blessed with words by the high priest of Rome. A petty scrap of territory was to be added to the Papal state, a slight accession of temporal power was to be

gained, and this was motive sufficient for the most imposing and solemn of ceremonials! If he did not approve of the enterprise, why thus authorize it? Is there then such a thing as trafficking with a man's own conscience? Is it possible that the infallible mind can sanction aught whereof it does not feel complete conviction? Certain it is that now, when the value of uttered words can be adequately weighed, the Pope stands convicted of hypocrisy from his own mouth. In the private interview which he accorded to Gavazzi two days after his arrival in Rome, he said, "Speak to me no more of Italy"—at that moment these words were interpreted, as arising from some potent and hidden cause—some political reason which perchance involved interests of importance to Italy at large: Pio Nono enjoyed then the blind confidence of his countrymen. In this confidence Gavazzi shared; and in the simplicity of trust he attributed this expression of sentiment to motives which it became him not to penetrate. Subsequent experience traced these words too clearly to their true source—a complete indifference to the revolutionary cause and to the redemption of Italy.

The chaplain of the volunteers began his march through the Roman states. His principles triumphed everywhere. He was enabled to employ not only the arguments arising from a profound conviction of their political truth, but the mighty engine of religion had been placed in his hands as well. Each man believed that the Pope had blessed the undertaking; the people, ever greedy of the wonderful, saw a miracle in the sudden disappearance of the German from Italian lands, and believed that the combination of events which tended to the regeneration of their country could arise from supernatural causes alone. Powerful then were the arguments which Gavazzi had at his command. The cause was just and sacred—it was the true cause, and God willed that it should triumph. Nor were illustrations from holy writ

wanting. They, the elect, were in the land of bondage, and the hand of the Lord was stretched forth to save them. How these potent weapons were employed by the apostle of liberty, let those who know him judge. Every day he preached the holy crusade, and each day saw the devoted legions swell in number. They entered Tuscany, and at Perugia a deputation of the chief citizens came forth to meet them, bidding welcome, and craving that the voice of one who preached the salvation of their country might be heard within their walls.

Embosomed midst surrounding hills, Perugia boasts not of her palaces, her commerce, or long-enduring monuments of art. A valiant, hardy race dwells here—men whose thoughts are free as the air of the mountains which they breathe—men who in sacred devotion to their country's cause yield to none. They cherish still with fond veneration the memory of a bishop, who boldly dared to stem the current of Romish corruption, and who, with a courage worthy of better times, cheerfully underwent persecution in the cause of truth. It is needless to say that here the reception of the volunteers was enthusiastic: Gavazzi was treated by them with a reverence little short of adoration; and had he been a man of less pure motives, ambitious thoughts might well have swelled within his breast and led him astray; but with him, one feeling, the saving of his country, swallowed up all personal ends.

The horses were speedily unharnessed from the carriage which bore him, and noble youths dragged him in triumph into the town. Before, a troop of damsels dressed in white went singing songs of fatherland, and strewing the paths with flowers, as did the Hebrew maidens of old before David. To dwell upon this scene of triumph were perhaps to wound the feelings of a living man, to whom this homage was paid against his will.

In Italy the feelings are manifested with all the

warmth and poetic passion which characterize the natives of a southern clime : no restraint is imposed upon the emotions ; and where love is felt, it is shown by demonstrations which, when not traced to their true source of sublime exaltation, might seem to border on extravagance.

His address to the Perugians was heard with a wild enthusiasm, and was followed by ample sacrifices cheerfully made on the altar of their country.

Passing onwards in their march they arrived at Bologna ; and here Gavazzi found himself placed in one of those critical positions which called for all the energy which characterizes his nature.

The Bourbon king gave orders to recall the important subsidy of troops which he had sent to aid the common cause in Lombardy. A revolutionary movement which had suddenly broken out in Naples afforded sufficient pretext for summoning back the Neapolitan army of 18,000 men strong, which at this juncture was posted in Bologna. Here the fatal order reached the troops ; and the dreadful alternative of disobedience to the king or to their country's call was placed before them ! It was an awful moment—a solemn pause ensued, in which men's minds were direfully agitated by conflicting doubts and fears. On the one hand spoke those prejudices which had been imbibed with a mother's milk, fostered in the schools, and matured at a later age in priestly colleges. Venerate and obey the king—adore thou the fierce monster “who hath the feet of a bear, the mouth of a lion, and who is clothed with blasphemy and abomination.” On the other side were ranged inspirations of more recent date—devotion to the cause of liberty ; a patriotism exalted by passing events ; and that deep religious sentiment which had been called into existence by the belief that the Pope, in blessing their arms, had sanctified their mission and ensured to them a certain victory. The people then will never see that liberty cannot

flow from the Papacy, whose very existence is dependent upon tyrannical institutions!

The moment was indeed one of supreme agony to all true patriots; for the fate of Italy stood trembling in the balance, awaiting the termination of this mental conflict. Did prejudice carry the day, the country was for ever lost: and if conviction triumphed, her redemption was at hand.

The scales of the balance were in the hands of the officers, to turn which way they pleased; for the men would have blindly obeyed orders. Unfortunately the views of the officers were opposed to liberty and the new state of things, and they were moreover bound by strong ties of personal attachment to the king. Severe and cruel to others, the monarch was ever kind and gracious, nay even fawning, to the soldiers; it was then that a few generous spirits rose up among them, and protested loudly against the fatal counsel of abandoning Venice and Lombardy as a helpless prey to the gripe of Austria; then it was that Father Gavazzi stood forth to reassure the weak of heart, and employed all he had of eloquent persuasion in bidding them resist the fatal order of recall. He sought with the thunder of his voice to confront the might of the tempest which he saw lowering over his beloved land: he saw in the return of the army a deathblow to all hope, and he would have parried it by the force of simple words.

Eighteen thousand men hovered in uncertainty—eighteen thousand men were to be gained over to acknowledge that all should be abandoned for their country's sake: for this, they should disobey their king, should risk life and substance, and renounce all that they held most dear on earth: forgetting the lessons of their youth they had now to avow that kings were but crowned tyrants, that the image before which they had so long bowed down was but a senseless idol, and that what they had been taught

to venerate as awful realities were but vain delusions and empty phantasms.

Gavazzi's courage rose with the tremendous exigencies of the occasion. He threw himself into the midst of this armed multitude, to whom he was a stranger. His form seemed to dilate, his eyes flashed with unusual fire, and his mighty voice gathered a wondrous strength as he proclaimed, in a strain of passionate eloquence, such as sacred zeal alone can inspire, the danger of his country, and implored them to interpose, avert, and save. The commotion ceased, all sounds were hushed, an attentive silence reigned, minds began to waver, and it seemed for a moment that the day was gained and Italy free. But it was written that the time was not yet ripe : it was written that Italy had yet to pass through bitter trials of blood and sorrow, of slavery and of infinite misery : it was written that another day of servitude and woe should stand inscribed in life's annals (alas! why is it not permitted to blot out the dreary record?), it was written that Italy should not yet be free, because it did not yet seem good to infinite Wisdom that tyranny should cease.

The words of Gavazzi fell on heedless ears. A murmur of disapprobation arose, first among the officers; and a few menacing injunctions whispered to the soldiers sealed the fate of the preacher's discourse. Satan had blinded their hearts—falsehood took the garb of truth—truth in her naked purity was made to assume a hideous semblance, a thing to be spurned and execrated; and the love of country, love sacred and divine, seemed to their darkened minds an abomination and a curse. The king was the true emblem of justice—him should they love and adore—he was the hero, the god before whom they should bow down—The just man who spoke before them was a child of evil, and his words were the words of impiety and perdition.

To the growing discontent of the soldiers, Gavazzi answered by renewed appeals to their patriotism. His stentorian voice was long heard above the storm of menace which raged around him ; and when at length it was overpowered by the hoarse shouts of the armed multitude, there burst from him a long, loud cry of anguish—the desperate cry of a man who sees that the dearest hopes of his soul are utterly lost. A few last words fell from the fearless man, but the voice of truth was drowned amidst angry cries of death.

He ceased at length, seeing how vain was every endeavour to move them from their purpose ; and turning his back upon the doomed crowd moved sadly and slowly away. He feared not the prospect of impending death, since life to him was as naught, if by its sacrifice he could have saved his country ; but his heart bled within him, as he thought how surely the die was cast against the cause of freedom.

A memorable but mournful instance of patriotic devotion here occurred. Colonel Lagalla was one of those men to whom all was contained in the words “my country.” As his love for Italy knew no bounds, so did he not hesitate to confront all danger for her sake. Flinging himself in the path of the infuriated beings who were thirsting for the blood of their fellow-men, he prayed them, in words of passionate and seemingly irresistible entreaty, not to abandon their country in this hour of her extreme need. He likened them to children towards whom a weeping and disconsolate mother stretched her arms, looking for deliverance. They needed but to put forth their hands to save her from the precipice on whose brink she stood—not to save was to slay—inaction was death—would they look calmly on, and see her perish to whom they owed their life ? All was vain—the dreadful image of matricide failed to deter them from their fixed and inexorable resolve to return. Mad with grief at the spectacle of his country’s hopeless ruin,

the unfortunate man seized a pistol in each hand, and pointing them at his head, fired both at the same moment. He fell a stiffened corpse at their feet. May God have mercy upon the soul of this misguided man, who, in a moment of supreme woe, forgot that life was not his to take away! May he be forgiven who laid violent hands upon himself, not knowing what he did—in no rebellious spirit against his Maker's works, but moved by the desperate hope that his lamentable fate might perchance influence those perverse men who were deaf to the voice of reason and entreaty. The soldiers remained unmoved at the terrible spectacle; passive obedience is the soldier's creed, and the march homeward was commenced.

It was the 5th of May, and the anniversary of Pius' election was being celebrated with all pomp at Padua. The splendid cathedral was crowded with people listening to the words of the officiating bishop, when the vanguard of the Roman auxiliaries entered the town. At their head marched a man of elevated stature, habited in black, with a cross upon his breast. He seemed a second Peter the Hermit, at the bidding of whose voice all Europe took arms to reconquer the holy land from the infidel. Padua joyfully hailed the arrival of such men with such a leader; the chief citizens bade them welcome, and invited them to assist at the completion of the ceremony in the cathedral. Jaded and way-worn they entered the sacred edifice; and Gavazzi, oppressed as he was by the fatigue of a toilsome march, found himself compelled to yield to the pressing solicitations of all, backed by the bishop's ready assent, that he should speak to them words of comfort and exhortation. It was a noble sight to see this man, with dusty garments and form all disordered, ascend the pulpit, and with unabated zeal, with undiminished fire, declare his mission and its lofty purpose. This courageous eloquence, which seemed to defy all obstacles, inspired the Paduans with an enthusiasm so great that, forgetful of all

discretion, or believing perhaps that such energy was inexhaustible, they entreated him not to leave their town without addressing them once more. He consented to their request, and preached the same day in the great piazza at five in the afternoon to a mighty concourse. All that Padua contained of young and old, of either sex, were there to listen; and none went away without feeling that his rare and wondrous eloquence had more than ever endeared their country to their hearts.

Hence the army marched on to Venice; and here, as everywhere, Gavazzi was the observed of all observers. Manin, the president, and his colleagues waited on him and asked him to address the people in the Piazza San Marco, on behalf of the sacred cause.

At the outbreak of the revolution the Venetians had shown themselves but lukewarm supporters of the cause of independence, but they subsequently nobly redeemed themselves from the charge of indifference; and by their brave defence of their beloved city, patiently enduring all the horrors of war, famine and pestilence ere they yielded to an overwhelming force, amply deserve the first place among those devoted men who sacrificed all for their country's sake. They too received a mighty impulse from the voice of the great preacher.

The Piazza San Marco was the theatre chosen—Venetians were the auditors—Gavazzi was the preacher. Theatre, auditors and preacher were well worthy one of another, and combined to form a spectacle of rare and engrossing interest. The orator and the vast mass of the people who had thronged eagerly to listen to him, were standing in a spot adorned by glittering palaces, each stone of which spoke of those days of long-enduring triumph when the Lion of Venice rode the wide seas in proud supremacy: these memories of the past filled the minds of all, as they saw the apostle of freedom before them.

He, who had already endured toil, persecution and privation, who had braved the perils of a long and weary march, who had set at naught the enmity of potent adversaries which his gifted eloquence had raised around him, now stood before them, about to speak of liberty and love of country, and, surrounded by the eternal records of what had been, he was about to show them that which they again might be.

It is easy to imagine and infer from our knowledge of Gavazzi's resources, in what elevated language he treated the subject of his every-day thoughts, how he revelled and luxuriated in glorious images created by the suggestive objects which met his eye on every side ; how those who thought with him derived fresh argument in support of their convictions, and how his opponents when not persuaded were still fascinated and almost made to believe against their will. Unfortunately these oratorical treasures coming fresh from the mint of the brain can only be valued by their after effects, for Gavazzi nearly always spoke without note or preparation ; and as thought followed thought with wondrous rapidity in his mind, so he uttered them without taking heed how they were gathered. He threw the seed forth with liberal hand, trusting that it would fall on good ground, and bear fruit in due season.

A task worthy of his powers now devolved upon him. An appeal was to be made to the inhabitants of Venice in behalf of their suffering and indigent countrymen, and Gavazzi was again the man chosen to be the advocate of charity. Again he spoke in the Piazza San Marco, and he was heard—he prayed for aid, and aid was given. From that day commenced a series of heroic sacrifices, which almost pass conception ; poor and rich, alike without distinction, joined in forwarding the good work ; there were none, high or low, who gave not something : those who had not money gave rings, garments, necklaces or jewels. It was a truly touching sight to see the women of Venice strip

themselves thus voluntarily of those ornaments which enhanced the charms of a beauty which is proverbial ; and, with a smile of noble satisfaction, sacrifice those glittering baubles which the sex so highly values, prizing them as naught when compared with that gem of highest moral worth—charity. Some idea may be formed of the extent to which these benevolent feelings were carried, when it becomes known that in those times in which distress and want reigned generally, upwards of 120,000 francs were collected in one single day.

Meanwhile the German hordes poured down on the Venetian territory, and daily the Austrians gained ground. Throughout the horrors of the war Gavazzi never quitted his men, and in each fierce encounter was always to be seen exhorting and encouraging by words and fearless exposure of himself, his fellow-soldiers. Subsequently too, in the retreat of the Piave he aided in the brave defence of Treviso, where the besieged demeaned themselves so heroically, as to extort admiration even from their enemies. At the capitulation they were permitted to march out, not only with all the honours of war, but also to take their cannon with them. It was thus that the iron Radetzky showed, with true soldier-like feeling, the estimation in which he held true bravery, even when it came from enemies, and so-called rebels.

In this retreat Gavazzi had to suffer much. He could not pass unnoticed amidst the hostile squadrons. His lofty stature and frank aspect, the priestly garment and the ample cross which covered his breast like a cuirass, all marked him out for notice. His wide reputation had moreover made him known everywhere. It was not likely that an ungenerous enemy would miss this opportunity of showing their detestation of the cause, when its chief supporter and most ardent advocate was in their power. In truth no insult was spared either of word or action—they thrust their filthy hands in his face, they hustled him like a pick-

pocket, adding some ignominious epithet as they pushed him from hand to hand ; bayonets and swords were pointed at his breast, accompanied by empty threats of death. No vile treatment which the vulgarity of a hostile mind can devise was omitted ; and things were done from which the imagination shrinks, and which we will not sully our pages by recording. He bore all with a meekness worthy of his calling, restraining the rebellious Adam within him by the remembrance of the mightier sufferings of that divine Master of whom he felt himself to be but an unworthy disciple.

But he was not alone. Throughout the struggle for independence four brothers fought by the side of Gavazzi. The same family from which had sprung the man of eloquence had also furnished a devoted band of brothers to fight and die for their country. To them, the men of action, soldiers and brave men, the spectacle was most galling. Insults, not to avenge which was deemed dishonourable by the soldier's creed, were offered before their eyes to a beloved object : every emotion which a generous mind can feel was roused, and yet must be suppressed : with quivering limbs and swelling hearts they were compelled to look idly on, knowing too well that any mad effort on their part could but have entailed their own sacrifice, without availing in aught to protect their brother. Could the bitterest enemy have invented a more refined torture ?

It should in justice be mentioned that the younger officers and soldiers alone were guilty of these insolent excesses, and that the older among them, if not kind, were at least considerate in their treatment of Gavazzi.

The different troops which had been scattered abroad after the siege of Treviso met again together at Mestre, with the intention of going forward to Venice. Here the famous free Italian legion was formed ; a body of men who were among the foremost in the heroic defence of Venice. Gavazzi did not

remain long with them. He felt that his mission was to continue adding fuel to the fire of patriotism, where it seemed to burn but feebly in the hearts of his countrymen, and he bent his steps towards Florence. In this town he had already been well received; and now, his past sufferings in the cause made his arrival doubly welcome.

At Florence, yielding to requests often and pressingly urged, he resumed his discourses, endeavouring to inculcate on the minds of the people the ends which true liberty contemplated—he sought to rouse those who were indifferent, to conciliate his opponents, to restrain the headlong impetuosity of partisans, and above all combated, like a true moralist, against those patriots who “licence mean when they cry liberty.” Lofty as were the views which he advocated, morally true as were the lessons which he taught, he failed not nevertheless to give umbrage to a weak and suspicious government, which found sufficient ground for accusation in the influence obtained by his eloquence over the people. He was seized, and conveyed across the frontier under the escort of a troop of dragoons: on the way he was treated with every consideration, and at the bridge of Scaricasino, which marks the boundary-line between the Florentine and Papal states, they left him in the hands of the inhabitants, who warmly greeted his arrival among them. It was his design to have journeyed on to Bologna; but half-way, friends met him with the information that certain arrest and imprisonment awaited him, should he set foot within the town, and recommended further that he should carefully avoid the beaten track on his path onwards, since parties of soldiers had been posted on all the principal roads with orders to capture and bring him back to Bologna. Upon receiving this news, he determined to visit one of his relations who lived at some distance, in the hope of passing a few days with him in that tranquillity and repose of which he stood so much in need.

After a journey full of difficulties, dangers, and privations, he succeeded in at length reaching the desired haven, and found a home under his cousin's humble roof. His new resting-place was situate about twenty-four miles from Bologna; and here he received, in secret, visits from his friends with whom he held long and entertaining converse.

It was impossible that he should live long here unobserved. Information soon reached the authorities of his hiding place, and orders were issued for his immediate arrest. Tidings reached him of the intentions of his enemies from a truly unexpected quarter. It was a cardinal who sent him the timely warning, and counselled him to fly. Cardinal Amat, Governor of Bologna, was one of those rare men who have moral courage sufficient to act in consonance with their convictions, in spite of prejudice, place, and the fear of offence. Living among men of evil ways, he shunned not the straight path. A dependant upon despotic institutions, he was not an opponent of liberty. He contrived to let Gavazzi know of the danger which awaited him; and, upon receiving a grateful letter of thanks from the poor victim of persecution, sent him that pecuniary aid which was indispensable to enable him to pursue his journey. All praise be given to this brave man, who, though cardinal, governor and magistrate at once, feared not to incur a triple responsibility when by so doing he could protect an innocent man. In examining the long list of men who were the willing instruments of a pope, who had already shown himself in his true papal colours, who were the slaves of the most complete of all tyrannies, the mind dwells with a grateful pleasure upon this solitary instance of freedom and courage. It was then possible that even among the priestly magnates a man might be found willing to admit that personal interests become insignificant when compared with the weightier considerations of humanity and charity.

Gavazzi selected Milan as his next place of refuge; but in this city his voice was not heard. The Milanese were in a strange state of division and perplexity. Some of them were more than half-inclined to believe in the sincerity of Charles Albert, but none had any confidence in his generals. These were almost without exception men of the old school. They had retained the ideas, but no longer possessed the valour of their ancestors. They were ignorant and faithless, and could not conceive such a miracle as the regeneration of a people whose parity with themselves they could not be brought to acknowledge. Thus it was that on the one hand, doubts gave rise to intemperate ebullitions, and on the other hand, these very excesses served as so many illustrative arguments in favour of the old despotic regime. To this schism of opinions, added to the utter want of experience in the generals, were due the disastrous termination of the Lombardy campaign, and the disgraceful capitulation of Milan.

Seeing that this was the condition of parties when Gavazzi entered Milan, it would have been worse than useless for him to have spoken. He could only have increased the irritation of party-feeling, without in any way advancing the cause of freedom. No entreaty could induce him to depart from his fixed resolve, and during the whole of his stay he never spoke in public. When Milan capitulated he formed one of the large body of emigrants. The number of persons who quitted the city was prodigious, and might serve in some sort as a measure of the hatred borne by the vanquished to the victors. Here might be seen women abandoning all the comforts of home, the newly-born infant in their arms; there old men teaching their tottering limbs to carry them far from the tyrant's reach—the rich leaving their palaces to the remorseless pillage of the conqueror; the streets full of men, of women, of old and young, all actuated by one and the self-same feeling—all ready to brave

the terrors of exile with its inevitable concomitants of misery, suffering and hunger ; nay, perchance, of death, rather than live as the oppressor's slaves. Truly a brave people these same Milanese, and deserving of a better fate.

In the society of many of the exiles Gavazzi repaired to Genoa, and here he would have broken his long silence, but the face of things had already begun to show symptoms of a change. As misfortune followed on misfortune, so did the bitterness of party feeling increase. Royalists and republicans overwhelmed one another with accusations and recriminations. The truth is, that with the fall of Milan, the fate of Italy was decided. Noble efforts were doubtless subsequently made, but they were attended with no beneficial result. Venice, Genoa, Bologna, Leghorn, and Rome, served by their brave resistance to show how deeply rooted is the love of country in Italian hearts, and their courage and devotion to the cause of freedom will cause the name of Italian to be respected, spite of the cavillings of foes, both by present and future generations. The sacrifices which these cities made will not be thrown away in times to come, but for the time being they availed not to save Italy.

Let us cast an eye over the rest of the kingdom. Piedmont was powerless ; she either could not or would not aid the sacred cause. In Naples, the Bourbon was triumphant ; and in Sicily the struggle, if violent, was also hopeless. An undisciplined multitude had no chance with soldiers inured to all the toils of war ; and even had an advantage been obtained, as at Rome and Venice, it could only have been temporary, for the tyrants of Europe had resolved that Italy should perish, even should it be found necessary that republicans must fight against the republic to attain this end.

At Genoa great agitation reigned. As at Milan, party feeling ran high, and the democrats brought

every engine into play, being conscious that the only chance of turning the scale remained with them. Gavazzi was invited to address the people, but Gioberti, who was now minister, forbade him to speak. Perchance at no other moment was it more important that a powerful appeal should be made to men's minds ; at no other moment would it have been attended with more efficacious results, and precisely for this reason was silence imposed on Gavazzi. What he could not do publicly he strove to do in private. He was invited everywhere and requested to explain his views, but the Piedmontese system of espionage under Gioberti was in no way inferior to the Austrian ; and spies were commissioned to follow Gavazzi continually, thus rendering it dangerous, and useless at the same time, for him to speak his sentiments with anything like freedom.

The papal prejudices entertained by Gioberti, and the blind pertinacity with which he pursued a certain system, rendered him Italy's worst enemy at this juncture.

While this was the state of affairs at Genoa, a fearful visitation fell upon the Bolognese. Whether the result of diabolical instigations on the part of the opponents of progress or the consequence of social disorganization, it is difficult to say, but the assassin's trade was daily plied at Bologna. The secrecy and suddenness with which the blow is struck—the knowledge that life is secure at no moment—that neither innocence nor guilt are safeguards—that age or sex form no protection—inspire even the most courageous with a dread of assassination as the most terrible of all deaths. The husband goes forth in the morning, not knowing whether he will be again permitted to see his wife ; the father leaves his family, uncertain whether he has not clasped his children to his breast for the last time.

It is thus that liberty, when unrestrained by wholesome checks—when not founded upon virtue and

morality, and further backed by sound institutions. leads to the most fearful excesses and crimes.

No means which the citizens of Bologna could adopt were found competent to rid them of this awful scourge, and as a last resource they entreated Gavazzi to come among them, and endeavour by the power of his eloquence to lay the spirit of blood and slaughter which had entered men's hearts, and which rendered their fair city a scene of death and desolation. Gavazzi at once accepted the perilous task and quitted Genoa, his lofty soul rejoicing in the noble enterprise laid before it.

On his way he passed through Leghorn, and though his stay here was of necessity very brief, yet would he willingly have spoken a few words to satisfy the longings of those who had been among his earliest disciples. But the Tuscan government viewed him with suspicion. To explain this, and for the better understanding of what follows, a brief digression becomes necessary.

When Milan fell, Florence and Tuscany were divided into two parties. The government called itself liberal, but the ministers,—sincere men enough in their way,—belonged to the old school, while the Grand Duke, who played the part of a good man, but took his cue from the worst counsellors, was nothing better than a hypocrite. The defensive attitude assumed by the Livornese and the democrats of Tuscany was not uncalled-for or unjustifiable, since nothing but fair words had as yet been received from the government; and had not the enemy been fully occupied with the Hungarian war, a descent upon central Italy would have been attended with an easy victory over a totally unprotected country. It was absolutely necessary that the democratic party of Tuscany should bestir themselves, because the favour shown by government to the good cause was a mere sham. At the outburst of the revolution it had with an ill grace granted the levy of a few volunteers who

fought bravely at Curtatone. But beyond this, what was done? Where were the arms and ammunition, which are necessary for equipping and sending an army to fight against the common enemy?

Had but the governments applied themselves to the great work with single heart and hand, what might not Italy now be? . . . Freed from the withering rule of the Teuton, what might she not have become?

But to return to the subject of this brief memoir. Guerrazzi, to whom the sacred watchword of liberty served but as a cloak to ambitious designs, had already spoken at Florence and Leghorn, and the mighty spirit of democracy was slowly wakening from its slumber, when it was destined to be thoroughly roused by one whose irresistible eloquence, whose indomitable courage, had acquired for him an Italian renown.—Descending from Liguria, Gavazzi appeared at Leghorn. The Livornese received the apostle of liberty with wild enthusiasm, but scarce had he appeared amongst them when it was intimated to him that he should depart and carry his turbulent spirit elsewhere. But the citizens of Leghorn suffered not this shame to fall upon them. It should never be said of them that they looked idly on with folded hands, while in a free state, the man of liberty was persecuted in a manner worthy of despotism. From this time forward, the angry spirit of the people began to kindle; loud outcries were heard; the retrogradists (rear-hangers commonly called) began to be disquieted, while a weak and impotent sovereign in vain essayed every poor shift which a policy of duplicity and tergiversation could suggest. From this date forward, the party of Guerrazzi grew in force, and widening his hostile influence day by day, suffered no check until the hour of triumph came. This was the work of Father Gavazzi. Though he spoke not, yet to his presence, to the memory of his resistless eloquence and to his devotion to the cause

of democracy, was this result dne. His glowing words had given form and consistence to the shapeless thoughts of the multitude, and, inspired by his presence, they passed from words to deed. He stayed not, however, to witness the ministerial crisis in Tuscany which had thus been brought about by his agency, but sped onwards, as had been his original design, to Bologna.

He entered this devoted city as an angel of peace with the olive branch in his hand. Few were the words which he spoke, but he fawned not on the multitude—he flattered not—threatening denunciations of wrath, not of man but of God, fell from his lips. He commenced his discourse with this solemn appeal: “I stand here, as I think, not in the midst of assassins, but surrounded by Italians and the citizens of Bologna.” Few and simple as were these words, their effect was electrical. The orator of nature had touched the true chord, and responding to the master’s hand, harmony reigned in place of discord; the assassin’s trade ceased, and the citizens once more paced their streets in the tranquil confidence begot by neighbourly faith and good-will. Thus was shown the mighty moral influence of a man speaking from the fulness of a true and generous heart. Gavazzi, by a word spoken in season, freed his country from treachery and the assassin’s knife, and the grateful Bolognese displayed towards him a reverence alone due to him who seemed sent as a messenger from heaven for their safety.

So closed the month of November; but already the spirit of retrogradism was triumphing in the Roman States under the ministry of Rossi and Zucchi.

The Pope had deserted the cause of liberty. The few concessions which he had granted to the Roman people weighed upon his conscience like some grave crime—he looked upon himself as an apostate, as no longer Pope, as the destroyer of the sacred edifice of religion. The priesthood, and more especially the

Jesuits, had been at work : they well knew their man, and so worked upon his feeble mind, that his few good deeds appeared to him now as foul sins. He had allowed his people to taste the sweets of liberty—he had promised that the days of slavery, oppression, and blood should pass away, to be replaced by the sweet security of law and justice—tyranny should no longer exist, but the true rights of the people should be recognised. Alas! he was told that this could not be—that his footsteps touched profane ground—that he was sinning against Christ and the Gospel. The monster of Jesuitism had seized upon its prey and held firm hold : The Vicar of Christ, the infallible mind, trembled : strange fears seized upon him ; demons and all the dreadful creations of a weak imagination, perverted by the agency of insidious counsellors, presented themselves in appalling forms before him, and he was led to believe, mourning in sackcloth and ashes, that by granting some small share of freedom to his fellow-creatures, he had offended against the Almighty, and compromised his eternal salvation! To such results could superstition, working upon a feeble intellect, lead.

The death-blow was then to be struck at the liberty of Rome, but for this an able instrument was needed. A man who had been the creature of Louis Philippe, who was well versed in the tortuous policy of the house of Orleans, and thoroughly skilled in every ministerial wile, was chosen. The odious task was given to Rossi, with the title of Pope's minister, nor could it have been confided to abler hands. The result is known to all. Nor is it our intention to speak of this man's lamentable fate, or of the stormy recriminations which followed thereupon. Another traitor, a Judas of a deeper dye, calls for mention in these pages. General Zucchi was a man in whom perhaps last of all, Italy might have expected to find a betrayer of the sacred cause. He had suffered every indignity from Austrian tyranny and persecu-

tion ; he had grown grey in an Austrian prison, and was thrust forth in old age to wander where he listed beyond the confines of the tyrant's realm. At Milan, where men looked upon him as a martyr to the cause of liberty, and as yet believed not in his apostacy, he was subsequently appointed to the command of the civic force. In his capacity as general he rendered himself universally odious by his brutal demeanour and tyrannical measures.

But the cup of his shame was not yet full. The hoary Apostate had yet to fill an office which will render his name an opprobrium and execration in the mouth of every true Italian. When the Pope sided with the enemies of his country, when freedom was to be suppressed, Zucchi became the ready instrument of his master's designs. Bidden to capture Gavazzi, he accepted the ignoble duty and arrested him at Bologna. As Austria had dealt with him in days gone by, so dealt he now with the generous Barnabite. So that his thirst for vengeance were satisfied, what mattered it to him who was the victim? To make others suffer as he had suffered was now the maxim of a man whose mind had been perverted to cruelty by the miseries which he had endured in his own person.

At Bologna, Zucchi, who was Rossi's creature, and the blind, or perhaps conscious instrument of jesuitical re-action, applied himself to extinguish the spark of sacred fire which still glimmered on the altar of liberty. He sought to bind liberty to her own altar, and, decking out the goddess as a victim in her own temple, would have officiated as high priest at the impious sacrifice.

He strove first to sow seeds of jealousy and rivalry between the Romans and Bolognese, and had well nigh succeeded in effecting a rupture between them, when his design was discovered and scouted. His next attempt was to make the soldiers the blind instruments of tyranny ; he sought to gain his end by

ruled them with a rod of iron, and when he had made of them, as he thought, mere disciplined machines, would have directed them against the cause of liberty : but here too he was foiled. Lastly, he performed his duty as *sbirro* in ordinary to the Pope, and arrested Gavazzi. What crime had Gavazzi committed worthy of arrest if he had only carried out the Pope's original instructions? Was it his fault if the Pope had veered round and had betrayed that cause which he had in the first instance embraced? Did not his lofty titular dignity of chief-chaplain to those pontifical troops who were to shed their blood on liberty's behalf, still remain unrevoked? But what mattered all this to Zucchi? His master asked for Gavazzi, and he obeyed orders by sending him under a strong escort to be delivered into his hands. Gavazzi was dispatched, attended like a common malefactor, to Corneto. The dungeons of Corneto were his destination. And for what crime was he imprisoned? He executed the mission entrusted to him by the Pope himself like a true patriot. What was his crime? He had set at naught fatigues, dangers, and death itself, to proclaim the truth of liberty—of that sacred liberty which is to be found in the enjoyment of social and private rights, untainted by all strife—an enjoyment which is attainable only by the paths of virtue. Where lay his fault? He had ever been foremost in the ranks when danger was to be met—he fought not, but he counselled,—he was not the man of blood, but the servant of Christ—his office it was, to exalt the warrior by the might of words, to bear consolation to the dying, and to teach them to embrace death, blessing their country, praising God, and forgiving their enemies. These were the crimes of Father Gavazzi, and for these was he doomed to imprisonment by the Roman Court.

His prison was a den of infamy. His companions were adulterers, poisoners, assassins, and the very scum of the priesthood. Of priests, but two kinds

are imprisoned—either men who have violated every sacred function of the garb they wear, or men who have too faithfully preserved their trust.

In the dungeons of Corneto, then, was Gavazzi to have atoned for all his brilliant actions by foul usage, hunger, chains, stripes, and every torture which Rome, proverbial for her cruelty, could make him suffer. These were the rewards which a malicious priesthood destined for a man who refused to recognise as God's works those impious laws which ratify avarice, revenge, and murder.

If it had not otherwise been willed by the Most High, Gavazzi would at this moment be lying in a loathsome dungeon—his name would have been added to the long list of victims immolated to the merciless bigotry of Rome. Another martyr to the cause of truth would have passed a life of miserable torture in the dark cells of some Roman convent, forgotten and unknown.

But Gavazzi was reserved for better things. The Lord spared his servant that he might unveil the iniquities of his persecutors. He was spared that he might, in the free lands of England and America, proclaim the faithlessness of the Pope to those who listen with too willing an ear to the seductions of Rome.

As he passed through Viterbo the people flocked round the prisoner. What had he done? asked they. What was the crime for which he was about to be punished? Had he violated any law—committed any crime? No. Why then was he led off under armed escort? The cry that he was a martyr to the cause of liberty flew from mouth to mouth, and in a moment the troops were surrounded and overpowered, and Gavazzi torn from their grasp. This bold resistance of a generous people to an act of sheer tyranny alarmed the Papal government. The times were critical; and this spark, if not speedily extinguished, might kindle a vast conflagration. These considera-

tions seemed of sufficient political importance to warrant an order for Gavazzi's immediate release. It would be safer perhaps at some future time to carry out their revengeful plans ; but the danger for the moment was too great. Whatever may have been the hidden intentions with regard to Gavazzi's future fate, they have been foiled by his subsequent departure into a country where tyranny is unknown.

Although he had thus been made free by the imperious voice of public will, it was nevertheless impossible for him to complete his labours in the Roman states. He could not openly oppose the reactionary proceedings of the government. Zucchi and Rossi had laid too many toils and snares to entrap the partisan of liberty ; and every attempt to renew his work would have been attended with great danger to himself, and with no benefit to the cause. The orders for his arrest, moreover, though revoked in a moment of fear, were not for this reason annulled. The wolf watched but for the sleep of the shepherd and dogs ere he pounced upon his prey.

It became a matter of necessity to quit the Roman states with all possible speed, and seek some other sphere wherein he might prove useful to his country. Venice seemed for many reasons the best place for him. There he could strengthen and encourage those brave patriots who had resolved to defend their city with the last drop of their blood ; he could prepare them to endure those sufferings which were already beginning to be felt, and which mounted, in the after horrors of a strict blockade, to a pitch of incredible severity. While Venice held out, the cause of liberty could not be said to be utterly lost ; Venice was the Palladium of Italian freedom, and so long as Hungary continued successfully to resist Austria, divert her troops from Italy, and embarrass her finances, all hope was not lost that Austria might fall and Italy rise.

These reasons determined Gavazzi, and he repaired

to Venice, where he thought he saw a large field open to his zealous labours.

But Fate often wills that men should meet with unforeseen and insuperable obstacles in a career of glory. It often happens that nobility of mind is unappreciated, that the purest motives are misconstrued and vilified, and that where a virtuous man fails to make his way, the intriguer and adventurer creeps in without difficulty. This is more especially the case in a revolutionary state of society, where events follow one another with such wonderful rapidity as to set judgment completely at fault. Intrigue and semblance too often triumph over merit and reality. To this misapprehension of men and things, is mainly due the failure of our revolution, and of this truth, our misfortunes afford us an illustration and a lesson at the same time.

We would not wish here to cast any unmerited imputation upon the character of Manin. If he erred in his selection of men; if those who administered the public affairs under him were not eminently fitted for the office to which he had appointed them; this fault of judgment in no way detracts from his character as a true-hearted patriot and a man of incorruptible integrity. We have only to say that as he was deceived in the merits of others, so was he also deceived with regard to Gavazzi.

This man, the constant aim of whose discourses had been to deprecate excess of every kind, to preach unity and fellowship, to warn men against the evils of dissension, and who had striven to establish true ideas concerning liberty—showing that it was only by respecting the rights of others that individual rights could be assured—this man—Gavazzi—the truest of patriots, was accused before Manin as the entertainer and advocate of the ideas of communism!

False and monstrous as was this accusation, it succeeded in its intent. Manin believed it, and fearing the fatal influence of such doctrines upon the minds

of the Venetians, gave orders that Gavazzi should be straightway removed from Venice. We can only blame Manin for precipitancy of judgment, since if the accusation were true, it was impossible for him to have acted otherwise.

Repulsed by the malice of his enemies from Venice, but in no way disheartened, the indefatigable Gavazzi looked around him to find a fresh field for his exertions. He found it at Rome, where a new hope had sprung up for Italy.

A new day had dawned upon the eternal city—a day as unexpected as it was memorable. The priest-king left Rome of his own free-will. He was not banished ; he was not driven out perforce ; but when he found the mask which he had hitherto worn insufficient any longer to conceal the hypocrite, and saw that all efforts to win back those concessions which had been wrested from him in the days of his pseudo-liberalism were vain, he fled in trembling haste, abandoning his capital and a people whom he had basely betrayed.

A new day had dawned for Rome. The crowned Levite had taken flight, and as though this had been the signal for the expression of sentiments long-suppressed, or which had been blighted by the withering influence of Papal tyranny, the Roman people arose and with one cry proclaimed the republic. They had long borne the crushing yoke of Papal dominion, and had been semi-brutalized by the policy of superstitious rulers ; but now it seemed that the spirits of the great heroes who lay entombed within their walls had risen among them, bade them fling aside their chains, and urged them on to deeds worthy the days when the names of Rome and liberty were one.

Scarcely however had the sun of freedom shed its first warming rays upon a people newly awakened to a sense of their rights, when France interposed with jealous arm, and siding with Austria, took arms against a sister republic. This deed will ever remain

a foul stain on the page of French history. Rome had arisen to do battle with her eternal foe—with him who holdeth adulterous communion with kings—with the tyrant who had prostituted her to a despot's will—with him who impiously arrogates to himself the title of Vicar of Christ—and France it was, who, with the cry of liberty in her mouth, stood forth as the champion of tyranny. Frenchmen they were, who beleaguered Rome, and suffered many a shameful check from Roman valour ere superior numbers gave them at length a victory more disgraceful than defeat. It is indeed a question whether France be not the worst enemy that Italy ever had : for while other nations were moved by a love of conquest or lust of dominion in invading our country, she found in jealousy of glory and a mere meddlesome spirit of interference, motives sufficient to justify her in opposing our patriotic endeavours to throw off the oppressor's yoke.

The descendants of Brutus and their ancient enemy, the Gaul, were again brought face to face in hostile encounter, and in the days of slaughter which followed none displayed greater valour and devotion in their country's defence than Gavazzi. With some few generous spirits like himself, among whom the name of Ugo Bassi deserves a prominent mention, he dedicated all his powers to temper and direct the wild courage which burnt with too fierce a flame within those patriotic breasts, and sought, by Christian admonitions gently urged, to teach that mercy and true valour went ever hand in hand. But it was not thus only that his voice was employed. It sounded loudly in the hour of danger. On the city walls, where the sole rampart was of living men, Gavazzi might be seen fearlessly exposing himself to the thunder of the enemy's cannon, and, foremost in the ranks of death, might be heard cheering others on in a voice that rose like a trumpet call amid the hideous din of battle. With a cross in his hand and the word of Scripture in his mouth, the man who struck

no blow himself imparted courage, life, and hope to those who fought like true patriots against the common enemy. Danger seemed to be his element, when, by incurring it, he could in aught protect the sacred cause, and often in moments of critical peril his loud cry, uttered in the extremity of anguish, "Save or die for fatherland!" turned the fortune of the day. Now again he might be seen by the side of some wounded sufferer pouring words of balm into his ear. The warlike cry was exchanged for soft tones of solace as he solemnly blessed the dying soldier and bade him hope for those eternal rewards (impiously declared to be forfeited) which the just man who falls fighting for his country shall surely inherit.

Gavazzi was everywhere—he was with and for all men. Under his auspices a hospital had been formed where noble Roman matrons played the part of nurses, esteeming an office which enabled them to tend those who bled in their country's cause, an honour and a privilege worthy of their noble station. Often might Gavazzi be seen to enter the wards, bearing on his stout shoulders some wounded comrade whom he had snatched from the thickest of the fight: he carried them, if living, where succour might be found, or, if past human aid, he paid the last honours to the dead. Nor were they his comrades and countrymen alone who received his pious care, but the Frenchmen had often to bless him who, forgetting all distinction of persons in the exercise of his holy calling, administered the last consolations to a dying foe.

And may we not here claim a large meed of praise for one, who, though a priest, demeaned himself so valorously? May we not pay a tribute larger than common to a man who, brought up by teachers whose oft-inculcated lessons of evangelical meekness send their priestly scholars into the world for the most part a timorous, weak, and effeminate race, still found courage sufficient in his own heart to do deeds which may well be called heroic?

Rome at length fell; nor can her fall be deemed in glorious. Weakened by a desperate resistance of several weeks, with her walls in ruins, breached everywhere by the French artillery, she yielded, seeing that valour, however great, must finally give way to superior force. She met her fall as a brave man meets death, without uttering a cry; but in the hearts of her children remembrances are treasured up which will not fade until a day of just and terrible retribution comes.

Rome was again in the hands of the Gaul. The floor of her senate house again echoed beneath the armed tread of a barbarian conqueror, and again the brave senators, who had been chosen by the people's voice to represent Rome on that day, received this new Brennus, seated and in solemn silence. Well might a blush of shame redden the cheek of the hired captain when he saw this solemn spectacle of ancient days renewed in our own, and felt how ignoble was the part assigned to him. Thus were our fetters riveted anew by France, who frayed the bloody path by which a weak and pious Pope marched over the murdered bodies of his subjects to assume a temporal power forbidden by Christ and the Gospel.

He, who impiously arrogates to himself the title of Christ's vicar that, by virtue of his assumed infallibility, he may daily violate the sacred precepts of the Gospel, considered all means justifiable which would enable him to pursue a career of blood, vengeance, and arbitrary power unchecked.

But what man is that who slowly paces through the streets of conquered Rome in sad and earnest attitude? His black dress, the mournful gait, the fixed and downcast gaze, all show one by whom woe's last extremity is felt, and for whom hope's last chord has been unstrung. He wanders like a spirit around the tomb of murdered liberty, and the dark apparition is viewed with love and veneration by

Roman eyes, while awe and hatred fill the victor's mind.

It is Gavazzi's form which thus stands out in living reproof of the perfidy and tyranny of France. It seemed to him that he could not abandon the city of desolation. He was willing to confront all dangers, to abide all consequences, so that by his presence he might ever offend and reprove the oppressors of his native land. But friends surround him—they spare no entreaty—they pray him to seek some repose from toil, to seek some haven of safety from the dangers which thicken around him: and though at first Gavazzi turned a deaf ear to their solicitations, he suffered himself at length to be overruled. Having learnt that the Popish gendarmes were watching only for a favourable moment to arrest him and deliver him into the hands of his bitterest foe, he hesitated no longer; and, taking advantage of a passport granted by the American consul, Mr. Freeman, the painter, who also lodged him in his own house, left Italy for Britain.

England, the home of so many of his oppressed countrymen, became also the chosen retreat of Gavazzi; and here at least he was safe from the persecutions of his foes, though sufferings of another class awaited him. Those scanty resources which he might perhaps still have commanded in his native country failed him here. He had not only exposed life, but he had likewise sacrificed the means of livelihood to the furtherance of that great end which seemed to him paramount above all personal considerations. To his family, impoverished most probably, as are so many others who joined in the patriotic struggle, he could not look for aid; and thus the man who had been accustomed to the love, respect, and consideration of all who knew him, and who, if he willingly set aside all comforts when duty demanded the sacrifice, had them at least always at his command, found himself suddenly reduced to indigence, and encompassed by all

the numberless ills which beset poverty. None knew him in England, nor was any one acquainted with his eventful history, the bare recital of which, would have claimed for him respectful sympathy and attention. It will not then excite surprise in the minds of our readers when they learn that the poor, persecuted wanderer had often to endure the terrible pangs of hunger. Nor is he the only one of our meritorious countrymen who has made forced acquaintance with the gaunt fiend; but poverty, raga, and starvation avail not to bow down the proud spirit of those who are supported by the thought that they suffer in their country's cause.

Gavazzi bore all without repining. Perhaps Providence wished further to try this brave man ere he was permitted to enter upon his appointed mission in England and America.

How nobly he has fulfilled, and is fulfilling that mission, we leave to the judgment of those who have heard him direct the thunders of his eloquence against the corruptions of the Romish Church—who have seen him strip the Babylonian harlot of those fictitious charms which have led but too many easy spirits astray from the true path. We leave the whole Protestant world to judge of the merits and potency of this foe who has risen up among them to do battle with the monster, Papacy.

If the reception of Father Gavazzi in England, was cordial, in America it was enthusiastic. His arrival, on the steamer of the 20th March, was chronicled in the morning journals, as one of the important events of the day. His movements in England had been closely watched by the entire Protestant world in the United States—where, according to a journalist of strong Catholic proclivities, the great mass of the population are “inveterately Protestant.” Being thus already somewhat familiar with his career and purposes, the natural excitability of our people was strongly aroused by the presence of

the hero-priest among us. Fortunately for that "first impression," upon which the success of every public character in this country so greatly depends, the personal appearance of Father Gavazzi was as impressive and attractive, as his life had been romantic. Tall, well made and well developed, the person of Gavazzi, with its graceful yet impetuous movements, seemed the very symbol of sincerity and power; while his face, beaming with earnestness and intelligence, his eyes flashing the fire of genuine eloquence, sent conviction to the hearts of the listeners, and gradually worked up a public excitement, deep and universal. Immediately upon his arrival in New York, measures were taken to give him a public reception, which took place at the Tabernacle, on the 23d of March. The house was densely crowded by a most enthusiastic audience, whose interest continued till a late hour without abatement. Mr. W. W. Chester occupied the chair, supported by Rev. Dr. Cox, Rev. Dr. Cheever, Rev. Dr. Dowling, Rev. Dr. Kennedy, and several other eminent citizens. In calling the meeting to order, at 8 o'clock, the Chairman remarked that in a community like ours, no subject could be more interesting than that of Liberty. We have learned its history, and obtained its numerous blessings, and therefore feel interested in its extension to other lands. In Italy, he remarked, it would, at one time, have emancipated those down-trodden people had it not been for its belligerent enemy, Despotism. But then, might triumphed over right. Now, however, the times seem about to change. Public opinion is now more powerful than armies, and the hours of despotism appear to be numbered.

After prayer had been offered by the Rev. Dr. DOWLING, the Rev. Dr. CHEEVER came forward and said that he held in his hand a paper from Rev. Dr. Patton, who expected to have been present at the meeting, but who was prevented by a severe cold.

The paper which he read was a brief statement of some of the principal events in the life of Father Gavazzi. He (Gavazzi) was the second son of a family of twenty children, and became a monk at the early age of sixteen. When but twenty years of age, he filled the chair of rhetoric and belles-lettres in a college at Naples. Soon after this he was ordained preacher, and removed to Leghorn. From here he went to Piedmont, where his peculiarly earnest and eloquent style of preaching attracted to him immense numbers of hearers. Here he incurred the jealousy of the Jesuits, and being obliged to leave the place, went to Parma, where he continued to preach with eminent success, speaking frequently as many as ten times a day. About this time, his liberal views having attracted the attention of Pope Gregory XVI., and somewhat aroused the attention of this pontiff, he was imprisoned, and allowed to preach only to the prisoners, of whom there were a large number confined. Being finally released, he went to Rome, where he commenced preaching again. While here, a day was set apart by some of the citizens for the purpose of celebrating and commemorating the memory of those who fell at Padua. Father Gavazzi here turned out and joined this party. For this cause, and for his liberal manner of preaching, he was imprisoned. Being at last released, he was the first to move in the great cause of Freedom, which was at that time waking up. He was the first man who paraded in the streets of Rome with the emblematic colors upon his breast. He carried the cross, which was his sole defence, and exposed himself fearlessly in the cause of truth. He preached the crusade of freedom to all men. He did much toward combining the forces of Italy against the Austrian armies. When the French army entered Rome, he was a proscribed man; but under the protection of the American flag, he was got away from Rome, generous hearts welcomed him in England, and from

there he has now come to our shores. He is now biding his time. He is ready to return again to Italy as soon as it is advisable for him to do so, and to go to preaching again to his countrymen.

Dr. Cheever also read a letter from the Rev. Dr. Urwick, of Dublin, expressive of his high regard for Father Gavazzi's character, and recommending him to the generous hospitality of our countrymen.

The Rev. Dr. Cox was then introduced to the audience, and proceeded to speak as follows :

"This meeting, my respected hearers, we may view as belonging to the apostolic succession of Metropolitan Hall. Some of you may remember that I was choked off on that occasion; and I am very much afraid that I shall be squeezed to nothing this evening, between two mountains—the Rev. Dr. Cheever, of New York, and Father Gavazzi, of Italy; and although belonging to the 'village' of Brooklyn, I do not intend to be made a particular piece of jelly to-night between them. It is a fact, my respected friends, that this meeting is not a mere product of that society, one of whose secretaries is with us. I consider it much more generic and œcumenical than Trent. And I am very glad that the proceedings of our meeting this evening will be heard from not only throughout our own land, but in the Old World also. I do not love *agitation* for the sake of agitation; but I love it for the sake of the ulterior good; even as in warm summer-time, I love the wind and the rain, which are necessary to make the atmosphere salubrious and breathable. Secondly, when the trump of Luther woke the people of Europe, had it not been for *agitation*, those grand results would not have been achieved which make us all Freemen and Protestants in this Tabernacle to-night. [Applause.] The principles involved in our movement here to-night, are so great, and so full of hope to unborn generations on this Continent and in Europe, and the results are so closely connected with the harps of Heaven, and

the anthems of eternity, that I can hardly see any *one man* in this great assembly,—I can rather see the great God in it! although I would not derogate from the character of our illustrious guest, whom we are soon to hear.

“The meeting at Metropolitan Hall was called with great propriety in behalf of Religious Liberty. That was enough to make the whole country come together on such an occasion—even if the Madiais, incarcerated in Florence, had not been the theme of the occasion. Did we sympathise the less with *them* because we were doing battle for principles? We were not ignorant that these victims were nothing but *specimens* of a large class—there being a great many others of the same kind in Europe. It is this sympathy that has made Italy’s history connected with bloodshed, and identified the Seven Hills as the *locale*. We are in a country, where I trust every man may take for his motto

“LIBERTAS ET NATALE SOLUM.

“*Freedom and my Native Land.*”

“I have not yet learned that it is a sin to have been born in any particular locality: and I welcome even my friend ‘John,’ who feels so deeply aggrieved at the interest which I take in the welfare of those sons of the Emerald Isle—whose native land I have visited with delight, and which, if it had the advantages, would produce some of the greatest specimens of noble manhood in the world.

“There are two passages of Scripture which I have always loved to put together: ‘Let all things be done decently and in order,’ and, ‘Where the spirit of the Lord is there is Liberty.’ This does not mean any splendid exhibitions of the *auto da fê*. No; nothing of the kind. A wise man loves liberty as the means to an ulterior end—a means of his salvation and eternal good. Our friend has met a great

change in travelling across the Atlantic; but how much greater the *moral* change when he breathes the free air of America! [Applause.] Under the expanding pinions of our national eagle, and where the dove of the Church hovers peacefully above us!

“‘Tis Liberty that gives the flower of fleeting life its lustre and
perfume,
And we are weeds without it.’

Do you ask me then why I love Liberty? I answer as an American patriot, in this country of my ancestors' graves—but more especially as a Christian—I love liberty for the sake of Christ and the hopes of salvation. For I cannot tell how, under the dominion of the Man of Sin, I could find the means of seeking an interest in Christ and his Covenant.”

After a few more remarks, the Dr. closed by saying to Father Gavazzi: Welcome to the United States of America! [Applause.] He then continued, (to the audience,) “I wish to stand aside, and let those nascent echoes speak to you for themselves. I wish to assure you that these are but the first fruits of the harvest of America and of the Antipodes for the good of Heaven, of this land, and the human race. Mankind must be free!”

Father Gavazzi then came forward, amid the most enthusiastic and prolonged applause, the entire audience rising and waving their hats and handkerchiefs, and cheering with the greatest vehemence possible. Quiet being at last restored, Father Gavazzi, who is a tall, well-proportioned specimen of the old Roman orator, with a keen, piercing eye, and an intellectual head, commenced to speak in very eloquent English as follows:

“In my first appearance before you, I have all disadvantages; because, generally speaking, I deliver my lectures in Italian—and in America, also, I shall also speak in my own language in my lectures. I cannot lecture in the English language, because I do

not know it well enough ; and therefore it would be a presumption in me to come over here and attempt to lecture in that language. I hope you will support me in my broken English as I attempt to address you this evening.

"I was for a long time, a Papist ; but, under the blessing of God, and preaching against the temporal power of the Pope, I was persuaded to abandon and disclaim all temporal and spiritual power of any earthly Pontiff or Potentate ; and resolved that we would have no more Popes in Italy. And I presume I should now be in the same situation with many of my copatriots, shut up in prison, or a dungeon, if I could be found by the Papal police. But God is good. And I found an asylum in the house of the Vice-Consul of America ; and I am very glad in my first appearance before you, to give my testimony to my friend the American Vice-Consul—namely, Mr. Freeman. He took me in his house, and for three days and three nights fed me, and provided me with an American passport, and took all care to have all signatures furnished, in order to facilitate my escape from Rome. And now, I will use my religious liberty for the good of my fellow-countrymen. My nation now is consecrated, to my eyes, to Liberty. I shall use my liberty for the good of all slaves of Popery in this country and everywhere. The Irishman I do not fear. I was in Ireland to preach to them ; I will preach to them here, in order to give liberty to those people who are so full of generous sympathies, but who are the unfortunate slaves of the Priests, the Prelates, the Archbishops and the Cardinals, who live upon the plunder and the misery of their flocks. But now, my friends, when I was in London preaching against the temporal power of the Pope, and all Popish heresies, I became a seceder. In America, perhaps some civil Protestant may say, 'they have not confidence in a man who will not avow himself a Protestant.' I am no Protestant, because I respect

all Christian and Evangelical Churches ; and if I am an Episcopalian, I might give offence to the Methodists, and so of other denominations. Therefore I am no Protestant. 'But,' some one may say, 'what are you, then?' I am a Christian! [Great applause.] But some may object, all infidels call themselves Christians. Very well ; I am not only a Christian, but I am a Roman Catholic! Yes? Well, all Papists call themselves Roman Catholics. Do they? Very well. Do they call themselves so rightly or wrongly? The Roman Catholic Papists are not Roman Catholics at all. The Roman Catholic Church is not the Popish Church at all. The Roman Catholic Church was established by the Apostle Paul, and not by these Popes. It is the most ancient church, perhaps, in Europe. Rome had no Pope and no Popery. I am proud to be an Italian ; and as such, disdain all Protestant domination. As an Italian Crusader, I preach it in Italy ; but as a Christian preacher, I promote the religious freedom of Italy. As an independent Christian, my mission is against Popery and Catholicism. I am no Protestant, because Protestantism is too little for me. In the sixteenth century Luther and Calvin preached against Popery. Very well. It might do well in the sixteenth century, but not now. To *protest* is also of but very little use, when Hungary lost her liberties in protesting against Russian invasion. My army protested against the Austrians ; but with no success. Therefore, for me to protest against Popery is too little for me. No! no! Popery cannot be reformed. Because the Pope himself is against abuse in this country. Therefore, I go by myself, and not protest at all. *Destruction to Popery!* No Protestantism, no protestations. Nothing but annihilation! Therefore, I do not call myself a Protestant ; I am a Destroyer. I hope I have explained my idea.

After some further remarks, the speaker continued :

"The Popish religion is the personification of the Monarchical Government. In your country, this large Irish emigration is intended to overthrow your American freedom. [Applause.] Obedience without discussion—slavery without appeal—these are the edicts of Popery. [Applause.] Are you Papists who disclaim against my appearance here in this country? The Popish system sends missionaries to all parts of the world. And will they accuse me of trying to disturb you? Disturb what! Disturb a dull lethargy and indifference.

"I came here to excite the Americans for war, in order that they may have peace. [Applause.] I came here to make war, not against individuals, but against the *system*. That system of Popery, which is bad, bad enough everywhere, *as the streets of New York*. I am independent, and therefore say your streets are very bad. In dry weather they are enough to blind people, and in wet, for mud. So with the Popish system; it is bad in theory and bad in practice. Popery is only ancient Paganism Christianized.

"I have my war against the Roman Catholic priests and bishops—against those Jesuits who have ruined Europe, and will yet ruin America, if care be not taken. This is my mission. Do you feel for my safety? Do not so, for I fear not myself. Do you say you have a large priesthood? I met a large priesthood in Rome. Have you a large number of Irish Jesuits here also? I met large numbers of Irish in Ireland, and I do not fear any of them.

"I am here to enlighten my Italian brethren, and to release them from the tyranny of Popery. I was in England exciting the sympathy of the people in behalf of my Italian cause. I am here, also, for this object among others. I do not ask America to go to war with Italy.—No! no! the blessing of God, and the iron arm of the American people will not make

my country free. It is your sympathy which I ask—your moral support—your Republican opinion and influence in favor of a just and right cause.

“This is what I ask from the American people, and under the blessing of God I expect to be answered in your free hearts in behalf of my oppressed country. I am here to free my country from the false impressions and horrible abuses of the Roman Catholic influence. I am here a soldier for the sake of my beloved countrymen. I am in America, finally, to revive my Italy, and to liberate her from the oppression of the Austrian despotism.”

At the close of the reverend Father's remarks, numbers of the most distinguished among the audience crowded round him, and were introduced. He was urgently solicited to commence as soon as practicable, a course of lectures on Roman Catholicism and the Jesuits—a request with which he complied; and the lectures were commenced only two or three evenings afterwards. Three lectures were delivered each week, in English, and one on each Sunday evening, in Italian. All were crowded, and at every succeeding lecture, the enthusiasm went on increasing. The closing lecture of the course was a scene of deep and intense excitement. The vast old Tabernacle was crowded as full as it could hold, with human beings. Perfect silence reigned over the immense crowd, as the moment approached for the Padre to make his appearance. He came, modestly yet firmly advancing, and threw a steady, self-possessed glance round the assemblage. All felt the magnetism of his presence—every heart thrilled in advance, with the coming electric storm of eloquence, that was to awake the slumbering deeps of their nature—and an irrepressible cheer burst from the audience. As before, for nearly two hours the orator held them spell-bound by the force of his eloquence, the power, the truth, and the sincerity of his own emotions and convictions. At the close, it was de-

terminated that this must not be the end ; and a solemn engagement was exacted, that the Father should return to New York, upon finishing his two promised lectures in Baltimore, and repeat the first course of lectures, in New York.

By this time, the attention of the entire metropolis—that curious compound of indifference and excitement, so difficult to arouse, so clamorous when once fairly awakened—was centred upon Father Gavazzi and his movements. All the daily papers regularly gave reports, more or less full, more or less correct, of each lecture ; and the *Herald*, *Tribune*, and *Times* even went so far as to employ Italian reporters, who had learned English, to sketch the Sunday evening lectures, which were given in Italian. Father Gavazzi, his mission, his lectures, were the theme of conversation everywhere ; and the general excitement rose to as high a point as ever it had reached even under the sway of Kossuth.

But it would be wrong, deep wrong, to Father Gavazzi and his mission, to compare him seriously with the Hungarian chief. Kossuth landed upon our shores to the flourish of trumpets, and the display of a public military reception. He came like a great lord, or prince, bringing a numerous and expensive *suite* of attendants and followers, all of whom were to be maintained at the public expense. Father Gavazzi, a poor Italian priest, who by his talents and his eloquence might have chosen a position for himself in the Roman Catholic Church, but who had sacrificed all these brilliant worldly prospects, and even endangered his liberty and life, for conscience sake—came unheralded, and alone—although on his arrival he found that America already knew and was prepared to warmly welcome him. He had consulted but his duty ; and, strong in that self-reliance which is the privilege of virtue and courage, he came to spread in the new world, a warning against the insidious wiles and destructive schemes

of Popery and Jesuitism—those two powers that war ever and ever, against human improvement and human freedom.

Another serious disadvantage under which the Father labored—and which would have been sufficient to deter any but a man of indomitable nerve and resolution—was his limited knowledge of the English language. All who know the immense difficulties of the English language, especially to Frenchmen and Italians—and how almost literally impossible it is to acquire a competent *colloquial* knowledge of its idioms and pronunciation—will appreciate the magnitude of the task which the enthusiastic Italian apostle of truth had set himself. Indeed, this difficulty, resolutely as the Father attacked it, has of course remained partially unsurmounted to the present moment. The reporters of the daily press, who are compelled to write in great haste and without the chance of a revisal, sometimes totally failed to convey the lecturer's sentiments; and, as will be seen, he himself alluded to this, in the course of one of his lectures. The present publication, we flatter ourselves, will obviate this great difficulty, and will enable the millions who do *not* hear Father Gavazzi in person, to acquire as accurate a knowledge of his facts and arguments, as is enjoyed by the thousands who do. This subject, however, is more fully treated of in the "Introduction" to the present work.

The reception of Father Gavazzi, by his countrymen in New York, rivalled in cordiality and warmth, that conceded by the native portion of our citizens. The Italians gathered around him at once, and accorded to him their countenance and support; whilst he immediately commenced inquiring in what manner he could best serve them and promote their interests. Without taking into account several considerable sums sent by Father Gavazzi to Italy, to aid his suffering countrymen there, we may mention that the greater portion of the money received for his lectures in New

York, has been devoted to the founding of an Italian church and to other measures calculated to advance the interests of the Italians in the United States.

At the urgent and unanimous request of his expatriated countrymen, he at once consented to deliver an address in Italian every Sabbath evening, during his stay in New York—but he resolutely refused to receive anything for this arduous additional labor so cheerfully imposed on himself. These lectures were among the most eloquent and interesting displays of the patriotism, the piety, and the enthusiasm of the Reverend Father. Speaking in his native tongue, and seeing himself surrounded by an eager, silent, and expectant audience, composed principally of his own countrymen, he felt himself entirely at ease. The always musical cadences of the Italian language fell from his lips, imbued with such grace, such power, such sincerity, that it seemed almost like the oracles of inspiration.

These lectures were uniformly attended by crowded audiences. On one occasion (April 10) the Father commenced the services by reading the tenth chapter of Paul to the Romans. Afterwards, he commented upon that portion of the epistle which promises that “whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.” “The Apostle Paul,” said the Father, “does not tell us to call upon Mary, or upon St. Anthony, or upon St. Patrick. This advice is not given by an English Protestant, but by the Apostle Paul. It is, therefore, totally unnecessary to invoke any other name than that of Jesus, for the simple reason that we are only told by the Word of God to call upon that name; this is a positive fact, whatever the Pope may say to the contrary.

“When I was in Italy” (continued the Father), “before the commencement of those movements which led to the late revolution, I preached errors; but I will return and preach the truth. Light brought by Paul came to Italy from a heretical country—from Palestine: so

will light come again to Italy from a heretical country. Pio IX. has sent us to travel—we have seen the world—we have learned, and will teach. Recollect that Christ said that his followers should pray to God to send laborers to the harvest—for the work is great—it is difficult—it is dangerous, and the laborers are few. The opposition we have to encounter in the population comes from the *women* and the *old men*. Upon these do the priests exercise the greatest influence, as it was in the days of the ancient Pagan priests, who, in every respect, resemble our Popish priesthood: the superstition and bigotry of the people are the sources of their existence. To combat these antagonists and face the prejudices of the masses, much courage is required, more than I should have had, were it not that I have been on the battle-field, after which I have nothing which makes me timid. The chattering of women, old men, and priests is a different music to the roar of cannon and the whistling of bullets. Pray, then, to God to send laborers to the harvest.

“The poor, superstitious Irish cannot comprehend that Political Liberty cannot exist without Liberty of Conscience. They think it possible to get political liberty alone: others, not Irish, believe that liberty of conscience can be procured by itself, without thinking about political liberty. Well, since both are mistaken—since neither can be had without the other—let us go in for getting *both together*. I have seen the liberty which exists in England, and I can testify that it is the Bible which gained it, and which keeps it. With the Bible in hand, the people preserve their liberty. Now, and in previous years, the punishment for preaching the truth in Italy is death or the galleys—but there is a good time coming.”

Then the Father arose and recited the *Pater Noster*.

A profound silence reigned throughout the audience. The text of the sermon was then read, from Matthew

xv: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

"Christ," said the Father, after reading the text, "came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. Christ gave that law which in His infinite wisdom He thought good for our salvation—that law of Christ, therefore, is complete: nothing can be taken from it, nor can anything be added to it. But in the Popish Church we have the precepts and laws of the Popes and Councils, which are many and directly at variance with the orders of Christ, and which cannot for that reason be divine. The laws of God are few, clear, just and of one mould: the laws of the Pope are many, obscure, unjust and of a variety of patterns. The laws of the Romish Church are not the work of one man, but of many men and many epochs—therefore they must be contradictory and many—one Pope and one Council undoing the work of preceding Popes and Councils. The Papal Church may thus be said to wear a coat of many colors—*patched, tattered, mended*—a sort of curious *harlequin's* jacket. The laws of the Church are too numerous to be efficacious—a machine which has few wheels works better than a complicated contrivance. So is it with laws, and so is it with religion. I speak from experience: the multiplicity of the laws of the Popish Church cause them to be contradictory—they are altered daily—twenty-four hours after their publication they are forgotten and disregarded.

"Christ said that man could not serve two masters. The people who reflect see that it is impossible to serve the Pope and Christ—therefore they end by serving *neither*. God ordered Sundays to be kept holy—the Pope orders the saints' days to be kept—the people keep neither.

"The more superstitious and bigoted the people, the more they are slaves of the Pope and his priests. All people who have not an enlightened biblical education

are bigoted and superstitious. We in Italy are far from being so badly off as the Irish in this respect, yet we are far from being free from superstitious impressions. If on the new year's day we meet a hunchback, or a squinting woman, are we not uneasy? Do we not say that it is a bad omen at the beginning of the year? But if we meet a funeral, are we not impressed with a panic? At Naples, if two straws fall accidentally on the ground, forming a cross, is not everybody afraid to touch them? Since 1847, these silly prejudices—the result of priestly education—are waning away. There are few left among the refugees. I have not an atom of superstition. Can anything be more absurd than to believe that it is bad luck to spill a little salt or wine? Yes, it is bad luck for the owner of the table-cloth, but for none else. And the young women are taught to look at the frost on the windows, so that, for instance, if they fancy they see a pair of scissors, they say that they are to marry a tailor. Now how very silly! All this is the effect of bad education, intended by confessors and Jesuits to degrade the people and keep them always in their clutches.

“I know no other law than the commands of God. In the decalogue we have everything. Love God—love your neighbor—and if we love God, he will love us. Is not this a great blessing? Should we not be happy at being able to gain His love?

“Now, how do the commands of the Church agree with those of God? The Church says, go to mass every Sunday and Fast Day; whereas, the mass being in Latin, is not understood. How few know what it is. You believe it to be a representation of the sacrifice of Calvary—it is nothing better than a puppet in the form of a priest mumbling, conjuring, eating, drinking, and washing his hands. How is the only festival ordained by God kept in Rome, under the very nose of the Pope? The people work all day—whereas, except in cases of necessity, they should abstain from labor on

that day. But if a father of a family be very poor, it becomes a necessity for him to earn bread for his wife and children, and it is the hypocrisy of the Pharisee which would interdict him from doing this. Give the poor man bread on his Sunday, and he will not work on that day; let them have something other than fine words. But the priest has the fat capon which should be the poor man's.

"Fasts were not ordained by Christ; they are not obligatory; Christ reprov'd the pretended fasting, the long prayers, and long faces of the Pharisees. What are many of these fasts? They are vows from some city, or Pope, or king for some visitation of the cholera, or yellow fever, or plague. One municipality issued a decree for the fasting on a certain day every year for one hundred years. No, no! Fast yourselves if you like it; we will do as we think proper respecting it. But it is a great mistake to suppose that the priests *fast—really and truly feel hunger*. No! no! no! If the African who lives on a little rice were set at a table with a prelate on a day of fast he would think himself partaking of a grand feast. As Christ said of the Scribes and Pharisees, they give the people burdens to bear which they will not themselves touch with their little finger.

"*Magro* (not eating of meat) is contrary to Gospel. Paul warns us that false prophets will arise who will order the abstaining from meats. This Popery has done—therefore Popery is false. Eat just what you like.

"Another law of the Church respecting confessing one day in the year and communicating at Easter is contrary to the Word of God. Christ would not order his followers to go to confess to a man who is often a rascal or is ignorant. Let us confess to Christ. The Jesuits uphold the confessional that it may serve as a *trap for the Liberals*. [Applause—which Padre Gavazzi requested them to desist from, as it would dis-

turb the neighboring congregation.] A man in the confessional is a spy.

"What is done at Rome itself with the Easter ticket? He who will not go to *Pasqua*, sends another in his place, to whom he gives three or five pauls (about two shillings), and who manages the ticket business. The whole is a mass of disorders. *I know it.*

"The prohibition to marry in certain seasons is merely to make money for the priests—for there are regular fees for *dispensations*. The rich must pay—the poor must wait.

"As to that dreadful abuse—*Tithe*—I shall say but little, for that is nearly gone everywhere.

"But the priests have long enjoyed the ecclesiastical property, which properly is public property. These bring in ten millions of dollars. If priests had less riches and were fewer in number, the people would suffer less, and the priests would be better men. Priests should not be forced to labor at a trade, but they should not be kept in luxury.

"Works of supererogation are contrary to Scripture. Ashes in the soup—flagellations—are all insults to Christ. The making crosses with the tongue on the dirty floor; all is false and pagan. The Franciscan monks are ordered to flagellate once at least every week. On these days an extra portion of wine is served out to enable them to undergo the infliction—which, being self-flagellation, each in his own room by himself, is seldom very serious.

"The priests pretend that souls have appeared from purgatory. This is false, because contrary to Scripture. The priests want the money for the masses, and they want to keep the people in ignorance. That is, in a word, the history of the whole concern. With this fear, if spirits come from purgatory, they frighten people from going near a churchyard—whereas, there is nothing to be afraid of. Men who fear nothing corporal have this superstitious awe. You see how the

priests contrive to crush every manly courageous sentiment, that the invader may trample over the land.

"All these evils would vanish before good popular education. This is what the Papists dread. They hate Protestant schools where no dogmas are taught, and where Catholic children could easily go to procure a good education—though Protestant children could not go into the Catholic schools, because Popish mummeries are inculcated. The domestic education of Catholics is also under the influence of the confessor.

"In 1848, however, the battalion of *Speranza* was the education of our youth. Bologna saw the valor of those youths, and Garibaldi can testify how they conducted themselves before the enemy.

"Blind obedience is the doctrine of the Romish priests. In Italy we have seen this—though in Ireland it is worse than with us. Let us have no blind obedience. Let us compare their preaching with the Word of God. Let us observe their private conduct, and respect such as conduct themselves well. Let us follow the example of such as are good. Christ styled them the salt of the earth, and ordered them to show us a good example.

"Popery is slavery—the Gospel is liberty. But for Popery we should have no barbarians in Italy."

We do not pretend, as we before stated, to give a full report of these Lectures in Italian—but still we could not determine to deprive the public of some permanent record of their general scope and tendency.

On another occasion, addressing his countrymen in their own language, the Father read some verses of exhortation from the Apostle Paul to the Romans, beginning—"Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer unto God for Israel is, that they might be saved."

"My friends!" then said the Father, "the Apostle Paul said, long before there were Popes in Rome, that he felt assured of their being full of light and glory. That was, I say, long before there was any Pope. Nor

could he have expected that any increase of light and glory could accrue to them in future times from the Popes; for he said, in the chapter we have just read, that 'Christ is the end of the law for all righteousness.' But you will see in a chapter which I will read by and by, that Paul prophesied something rather opposed to light and glory, as being about to come from Popery. The Romans were filled with the spirit of God before they had a Pope—for which, we have the incontestible testimony of Paul. That they have very little of either now, and ever since they have had Popes, we learn by our own experience, and the page of history. Therefore, our duty to God and to our country is, to effect the total destruction of Popery, spiritual and temporal.

"As there were saints in the early days of the Church, without a Pope, so might we be now, in the nineteenth century, without a Pope. Paul says, that wherever he went preaching, his testimony was corroborated by the gift of performing miracles. This performance of miracles is one of the claims set up by the Pope to-day in aid of his support from Heaven. This, on the contrary, is a proof of the falsity of Popery; for the miracles of Paul and the other apostles were performed in the early days of Christianity to convince unbelievers (such is the use of miracles), therefore, if miracles be performed in Rome now, this is proof that the Popish population are infidel, and require miracles to convince them."

Father Gavazzi then recited the *Pater Noster*, and read a portion of the second chapter of Thessalonians, ending at the twelfth verse: "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they might all be damned who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness."

"This," said the Father, "is the opposite to the first chapter I read, and it evidently is a prophecy of Popery as is amply corroborated by the writings of

John and other apostles. Is not the Pope the only man who raises himself above all men—is he not styled by all the writers of the Church, King of Kings, Vice-regent of God? Is he not greater than God? Cannot the Pope do that which God cannot do—for what is illicit for God is the same not licit for the Pope? Is not the Pope above all fight, as well as all might? The adversary of which Paul speaks? Does he not say, *'I am that I am?'*

"Compare every word—every syllable—every letter of Paul, and we must acknowledge that he prophesied respecting the Pope in the Vatican. He came not as a low fellow, but as a temporal prince with great power and with miracles. No person can be styled *beatus* who has not performed miracles during his life and since his death. The Church is full of miracles, legends, and saints—but as Paul says they are false miracles. Consider these miracles *philosophically* and then you cannot fail to perceive their complete absurdity. When Paul says that the eyes of certain persons will be so blinded as for them to be deluded by strong deceit, that they should believe a lie and be damned, the prophecy clearly alludes to Popery and the Papists. If any one will continue Papist after reading the Bible, then, indeed, must he be stupidly blind or corrupted by worldly interest."

"What love had Pio IX. for Italy?"

"Just as the patriot army left Rome for Lombardy, I had an interview with Pio. I spoke to him of the love of Italy for him. *"Speak not to me,"* said he, *"of Italy—mind, not to speak to me of Italy."* The Pope had blessed the banners, we were on the point of leaving, and he said, *"Where are you going? You shall not cross the Po."* I told him that on the other side of the Po there was a province—the lower *Possessino*—taken from the Pope by the Congress of Vienna. I said that we would get that for him again, and then eagerly he said, *"Ah, yes, good, GET THAT!"* Let our

cry be *Fuori i barbari!*—but first of all—*Fuori il Papa!* (Out with barbarians—out with the Pope.)

“As a Christian, I cannot approve of the Sicilian Vespers. But the Sicilian Vespers effectually settled the French intervention in Sicily—none escaped. That blow was a lesson that nations cannot with impunity oppress other nations, and that a day of retribution must arrive. We must in our affairs act, so that whatever be done, be done properly, and not like children. But, as a Christian, I cannot approve of the Sicilian Vespers.

“The Popes have always excited bloodshed in Italy. Genoa was urged to war against Pisa, and when that city was subdued, the Pope exulted with Florence, Vienna, and other independent governments. The League of Cambray was the work of a Pope. Lucio II., a Pope, in person led the storming party against the capitol; a stone laid him low, and shortly he was a corpse.

“Such is Popery in Italy. If you desire to have nationality, commerce, happiness, wealth, instruction, liberty, security, glory, you must get rid of Popery. Either be miserable bigots and have Popes, or cast aside Popes and be free. Have no obedience to a Pope. Destruction to Popery!

“Tomassio says, give a little city to the Pope to exercise his sovereignty. No! If we give him ever so small a city, the rest of Italy and of the world can enjoy no security. Destruction to Popery. [Bravo]. But it is silly to talk about giving the Pope a little city, for to force him from Rome into the little city we must make a revolution, and then we had better force him away altogether. Surely we should never be so silly as to give him ever so little a city after the experience we have had. No! no! No more Pope at all.

“The movement of 1821 would have been satisfied with a constitution given by Austria. 1831 would have

been satisfied with a few reforms. 1848 demanded the Unity of Italy. So all has been progressive from 1821 to 1848. The next movement must be yet more progressive.

"Rome is the proper capital of Italy. Venice, Genoa, Florence, Bologna, Naples, Palermo, have their glories, but Rome stands unrivalled. Rome—but *without a Pope.*"

It is not the least among the evidences of the deep interest felt in Father Gavazzi by his own countrymen, that his Sunday evening Lectures were always crowded, although nothing could be more simple and bald of all extraneous attractions, than the entire service. No music, no accessories of any kind: nothing but a chapter from the Bible, the Lord's Prayer, and the Address.

On the 24th of April, the Father commenced the service by reading the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. After which, he said, "The beautiful chapter which I have just read shows that we are called upon to perform good actions. Those who do so will reap their reward. Faith, charity, and justice—these three words express the means by which we can obtain heavenly and earthly happiness.

"Let us consider our duties as regard our actions, toward God, ourselves, and our fellow men.

"Our duties to God are comprised in the Decalogue. First, we must respect His name. I do not believe that any man is without the religion of nature, conscience, honesty. If I find a man having a religion which comprises the duties of man, I cannot exclude him. Christ has laid on us no superstitions—He only requires faith. His baptism is not merely water, but the Holy Ghost. Those who have the knowledge of revelation cannot be saved by the natural religion—they must be baptized and believe. We must not neglect the advantage we derive from being born in a civilized country. We are told in Scripture that we

should ourselves do honor to God by our good works, (not by going to confessions, masses, processions, &c.,) that men may glorify God seeing our works ; whereas the Roman Church says, that whoever is not baptized by her priests must go to hell. God has not created man to make him miserable and damn him in eternal fire. No ; whoever is cast into hell fire, is there condemned for his misdeeds. Recollect the conversation of Christ with Nicodemus. Job was born before Christ and baptism came into the world—*yet he is a saint*. If good deeds were not to save, all would be damned who were born before the advent of Christianity.

“ We must respect the name of God, and we must avoid swearing. Wherever the Popish priesthood and the Jesuits are powerful there is a habit of blaspheming—witness Naples, Romé [laughter]—the people there are constantly joking with Peter, Paul and the Virgin. Our Dominican friars and inquisitors used to amuse themselves with putting a lock on the tongues of swearers—on the poor only—the rich were never interfered with. In the beginning of the movement in Italy in 1847, Pio IX., who was then believed to be a progressive Pope, preached a sermon against swearing, and the people ceased to blaspheme to please the Pope. Now the delusion is passed respecting Pio IX., let us cease swearing to please God.

“ After your daily labor of the week is over, devote a part of Sunday to read the Bible. Not all the Sunday—I do not approve of certain Scotch and Protestant practices, keeping people at home or at church all day, with no walk or recreation. I have seen in certain places what this staying at home all day means—gossiping over *whisky toddy*—tumblers of toddy to enliven your hearts. I do not recommend you to do as in some countries (under the eye of the priests and Jesuits), go to bull and bear baiting—but repose and refresh yourselves.

“ Could it be possible to form a little congregation, it would be very desirable that the Protestants should not say that we are without religion now that we have disclaimed the Pope. We will talk of justice, and we will do justice to ourselves—not self-love—but a proper sentiment of our own dignity. I have seen enough of America to be able to say, that any one who works can gain his livelihood. America can give bread to all the emigrants. In England we had the misfortune to have £900 sterling subscribed ready for us when we arrived there in exile—and this was rather an injury than a benefit. Let every one work, save money, and make himself independent. Earth is a mother which lets none of her children want. Work, live and be temperate.

“ Do not take me for a temperance orator; that would be a mistake. I mean only *justice*. I do not intend, either, to preach against temperance in America. Total abstinence has the approbation of a large amount of people and some legislatures; and Paul tells us not to take wine if a brother would be scandalized. But now I speak to the Italians, and I do not entirely disapprove of wines and liquors. I must preach the whole Gospel, and not as some do, only those portions which please them. Christ says, that it is not what enters into the mouth that defiles a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth. Also, the first miracle he performed was turning water into wine, and not wine into water—and it was really good wine. Paul directed wine to be taken as a means to keep out of the doctor's hands. How, then, could I preach the Gospel and absolutely prohibit wine?

“ We are on the eve of a great convulsion; the Protestants are asleep; they do not see that temperance is a jesuitical movement. I do not make this assertion because its founder was a Capuchin monk, but on account of its ceremonies. The *nature of the society is jesuitical*—binding by oath its votaries to total absti-

nence, to propagandize, and to proselytize. Jesus never instituted it. Gregory VII., obliged priests to take vows of celibacy and poverty, and to observe fasts, vigils, &c. If Archbishop Hughes be taunted with these absurdities, he can point to the temperance societies of the Protestants, who can make no reply. This institution will bring England and America to embrace the other Papal fasts and abstinences.

"But some zealous Protestant may say, then you protect the drunkard, the masses being disposed to abuse the gift of wine. I reply that I do not protect the drunkard. I have heard Paul quoted where he says that adulterers, thieves, avaricious, drunkards, fornicators, &c., cannot enter into Heaven. Then to avoid adultery, which is the infraction of the marriage vow, shall we prohibit matrimony; to prevent thieving shall we not allow anything to exist for thieves to steal; to prevent avarice shall we prohibit property and commerce; to prevent fornication shall we prevent men and women from living? Yet the temperance people would destroy wine to prevent drunkenness.

"All the texts of Paul are not so rigidly adhered to, for the apostle wrote some strong remarks respecting women, which are not paid great attention to. I would not speak against the women, but certainly they are to be seen here in the present day in situations very different from the position marked out by the apostle. We have even curates—a *Reverend Antoinette*. Well! they will doubtless take good care of their flock.

"The best way to moralize the people is to enforce temperance and moderation. This may seem a long road to travel, but it is a sure way. How many drunkards do you suppose have joined the temperance societies? perhaps a million you may say—or one hundred thousand. No! Not a hundred. Barely a dozen drunkards. The rest are all those who do not like wine, and they make no great sacrifice in drinking water. I ascertained that in England (I do not speak

of America, because I am best acquainted with England), the number of drinking shops is increased since the commencement of the temperance movement.

"I cannot, in Italy preach a fiction of the Gospel. I find that wine does good to man. Christ made a miracle in its favor. I cannot preach against it. I am an independent man, and am not paid by any Protestant to preach any, practice any, which I disapprove. If I were working for dollars I would have stayed in England and should not have come to America.

"Our duty to each other is to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. Not to speak ill of each other, to speak well of each other and to help each other. The English respect the Poles, Germans, Hungarians, French, because they work. They are employed, and are gaining comfortable livelihoods in all parts of England and Scotland.

"On Thursday next, at the Tabernacle, the Lecture will be for the benefit of the refugees lately expelled from Piedmont and now on their way here. The government of the king is not to blame in the least. That government has, under the protection of England, protested against the large confiscations of the property of some of the first families in Lombardy."

It will be noticed that the above sketch of the Lecture in Italian, April 24, contains a passage respecting the temperance movement, which has been made the subject of a great deal of comment, and considerable misrepresentation. It is clear that the lecturer is not opposed to temperance—but only to the imposition of oaths, pledges, and obligations. This is a question upon which the best and wisest have always differed; and even yet, there are many of the ablest and sincerest friends of temperance who doubt the expediency of the present organizations. But the charge of being opposed to temperance was one apt to stick, and calculated to do a great deal of injury to its subject. Therefore, it was strictly in accordance with

the spirit of that jesuitism against which Father Gavazzi wars, to pervert what he really said, into the basis of such a charge, and, when he denounced the charge as false, to take no notice of the denial. However, it is late in the day for such appeals to blind fanaticism, to produce any great effect. Father Gavazzi has been, and will be, seen and heard, and his real sentiments will be read and understood throughout the whole Christian world. Misrepresentation cannot seriously injure the cause he advocates or assist that of the Jesuits.

On the 1st of May, Father Gavazzi again preached in Italian to his countrymen, from the following text: "The just shall live, neither shall dishonor be imputed to him."

"St. Augustin says that the elect of God can be distinguished among one thousand, by their orderly and exemplary conduct—they have in all times been called the flower. Martyrdom cannot be gained by the mere suffering of pain unless the cause be just. Those who suffer death for the crime of murder are not martyrs. Ankarstrom, Ravailac, and such men were not martyrs. Martyrdom signifies witness. Next to the cause of religion comes that of country, for which a man can suffer martyrdom. He who has suffered prison, persecution, privation, exile, or death is a martyr. The suffering of patriots for the cause of the liberty and independence of their country, gains praise, progress, and ultimately success for the cause. We should never be ashamed of being Italians. Our country, since the earliest pages of history, has had an existence. For talents, patriotism, arts, science, and glory, our nation stands the first in the world.

"The stupid, exclusive, bigoted and cruel tribunal of the Inquisition, strove to check all human improvements, persecuted Galileo, and dared to stigmatize the profound philosophers as the enemies of God. But there was a tribunal higher and stronger than that of

the Romish Church; that tribunal declared the great minds of the age, excommunicated by the priests, not to be *damned* heretics, but glorious martyrs.

"The love of God is the first love; country comes second. He who does not love the country which has given to his fathers their existence, is a bad man, spoilt by the corruption of the Church of Rome. The despots eagerly strive to cover their victims with ridicule and calumny. Do they succeed? Which is honored—Haynau the executioner, or his victim Bath-yani? Are the Bolzas and Nardonis honored? or do the people honor the Baudivras and the Montanaris? I had rather have been in the place of Caraicola than of Nelson, the hero of Trafalgar, who descended to the despicable crime of destroying a man through sentiments of personal envy. Our martyrs occupy the brightest pages of our history. Italy, it has recently been said, will soon be a nation of dead men. We shall see by and by. Our neighbors in Gaul presumed to taunt our emissary with the reproach that '*The Italians don't fight.*' Bravely these boasters came to Rome, thinking that the Italians would not fight. They soon learned to their cost whether the Italians could use the bayonet. If we fell under the weight of the quadrupled invasion, the dishonor belonged to the Frenchmen, the Spaniards, the Croats and the mercenaries of King Bomba. When the allied armies entered Paris, the servile Parisians went out to greet them, and the ladies waved their kerchiefs—vile, degraded, cursed slaves. We met our invaders as invaders should be met. With war, and not with rejoicing.

"On the field of Veletri I saw the difference between the death of the patriot and that of the myrmidons of the despots. I confessed the dying soldiers of both armies. The dying Neapolitan cursed his king, and died in the agonies of despair; the patriot soldiers died calm and happy, with *Viva l'Italia! Viva la Liberta!*

Viva Jesu! upon their lips. Despots have done their utmost to vilify us even here in New York—not *The Freeman's Journal* alone, but many others. Did they suppose that the dying patriot would bless the apostate murderer, the Pope? No! no! The patriot can only curse whosoever brings an invader into his native land. Pio IX. can hope for nothing but execration from the patriots.

"What mind is so vile as that of a Popish priest? The very bodies of the patriots who died defending the walls of Rome were refused the right of sepulchre, as *excommunicated*. But the voice of Italy declares that these men are not execrated; their bones remain whitened in the fields, witnesses against Pio. The stranger going to Italy admires our marbles and our monuments of stone—the real glory which they should seek for and admire lies in the bones of our martyrs.

"The Church, ruling with royal power, destroyed the unity of Italy. At the time of the first French Republic a glimmer of hope appeared, but was quickly obscured by the desire of universal French preponderance which existed in the mind of that nation. In 1817, in 1821–1831, steps were made in the public mind of Italy. At first, Italy, led by a few zealous men, was willing to accept a Constitution even from the despot of Austria; but these hopes were frustrated, and unjust executions earned for *Carlo Felice* of Piedmont the name of *Carlo Feroce*, and for the King of Naples the name of *Caracalla*. In these terrible times the confessional was used to draw information from the breasts of the unsuspecting Catholics; and this becoming known, gave the first serious blow to the Church of Rome in Italy. The dungeons of the Spilberg in Moravia were filled with the Italian martyrs. But in defiance of prison, exile, galleys, and scaffolds, the people made progress through the sufferings of the martyrs, and now NATIONALITY is the universal resolution from the Alps to the sea. The last invasion

brought into Italy by the perjured Pope—that angel, as his deluded admirers called him—has augmented the number of Italy's martyrs, but has sent the country forward an immense distance in the path of progress. Ugo Bassi, my companion for twelve years—so deserving, and never to be forgotten—the patriot who, through every danger, remained faithful to his country and to progress—wounded by the bullet of the Austrian invaders—taken prisoner by the French invaders when tending their wounded on the field of battle—he—the faultless, mild, virtuous, noble victim of Popish barbarity—was brought out to be executed by the invaders' murderous weapons, after having been tortured, *flayed*, *scalped*, by the sanguinary priests. What were his last words to his companions in martyrdom as they stood beside the grave already dug to receive them? 'Courage! in a few moments we shall be in the bosom of Christ. *Viva l'Italia!*' Seven balls pierced his breast—he fell—and, in defiance of the vigilance of the Cardinal, flowers were strewed upon his grave. I hear his voice; he says, *Avenge me—Destroy Popery!*"

The Padre then said he had a few words to say on a matter of charity for an Italian, which was favorably received.

He then spoke of the expected arrival of the exiles sent out of Piedmont by the Government of the King, and he recommended that no demonstration should be made by the Italians on the arrival of these unfortunate martyrs, because such a step would be a slap in the face for that Government; he recommended rather that a little committee should be formed, and that money be collected to help them.

The Padre then alluded to the fresh attacks of the *Courrier des Etats Unis*, which he ridiculed. "Let him scold; we will reply by facts, which is better than '*blaguer*.' Yesterday was the anniversary on which the French, in 1849, before Rome, learnt that the Italians could do something better than '*blaguer*.' Let

us show these *blagueurs* that we have a congregation. Now I have received the offer of a piece of ground to build us a chapel. The offer is not from a Protestant. We have many thorns here more than in England; but this is a rose among the thorns. I cannot, as did St. Christopher, take the chapel on my own shoulders; but will you make a congregation, and then the rest will be done somehow. Elect your own priest, and make a committee of management. Then let us show the *Courrier* that I am not merely a destroyer.

“Christianity was cemented by the blood of its martyrs—so is our cause. The *Crociati* were not rabble, but the flowers of Italy—the educated—the Vicentini, who, dying in battle, bequeathed 25,000 francs per annum for education—the universities—the artists—aye, and the schools. The Speranza of Garibaldi did prodigies against the troops of the Nero of Naples. The ladies, who had never before served their country, now asked to be permitted to carry a standard or a musket. You recollect the bride just married who fell covering the body of her husband—the brother who returned to bear to the wife of his brother fallen in battle the news of his death, and who was instantly desired by the widow to return to the ranks of the combatants to avenge him.

“The time of conspiracies is past—we only wait for an opportunity. The tyrants have brought the matter to a crisis: Union—vengeance. The blood of the martyrs cries for vengeance, as is written in the Revelations. No family among us but has some victim; but these martyrs will not have shed their blood in vain.”

The last of the Italian discourses related to the great difference existing between the Catholics and Protestants on the subject of Justification.

The foundation of Popery is built upon works of supererogation, while the basis of Protestantism is Faith. The decision of the Council of Trent was

dictated by enmity against the Reformers rather than by the love of religion. In anathematizing Luther and Calvin, the Council actually cursed Paul, Christ, and the Holy Ghost.

The text of the sermon on this occasion was taken from the 2d Epistle of Ephesians: "We are saved by faith and the will of God," not by our works. Justification, grace by grace, and faith in Jesus. Why is religion despised by so many learned and scientific persons? Because it requires too much, and we confound the religion of Jesus with Paganism, and there is so much incoherence, contradiction, and opposition to liberty. But this is the religion of the Pope—not of Jesus. Many ask if I believe. I tell you I do believe sincerely. When I was a Papist I also firmly believed; but now I believe in the Bible only, and I am unhappy when I find any one who does not. As I was never an unbeliever, I cannot understand how any one can be an unbeliever. My religion imposes on me charity and love: Socrates and all the philosophers had that religion.

"The fundamental basis of our religion is justification by faith and grace, that is, we are purified and accepted. We are not justified by our works; that excludes the *vanity* of good works. He who is baptized is saved. Our consciences tell us whether we are accepted. How can we be justified without Christ?

"Popery teaches us that those who work the most shall gain more exalted stations in Heaven. I tell you, the more of the Popish work you do, the further you will get from Heaven. If good works were necessary to save, then the sacrifice of Christ was not complete, but a further sacrifice is necessary, which is in direct contradiction to Paul.

"Then come the questions, Do you exclude good works? and, May a man live a bad life and be saved by faith? Good works are the consequence of faith, nevertheless, it is the faith which saves. No Protestant

excludes works. It is necessary for society to observe the laws of nature ; to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, and to help and protect each other.

“If you had been, as I have been, at the death bed of thousands of dying Catholics, you would have seen in what a state of uncertainty they die. And, why so ? Because, their justification being founded on good works, they are uncertain whether these works have proved sufficient ; whereas, if their hopes lay in Christ, they would be tranquil. This is why Protestants die so tranquilly. I used to believe in and to recommend myself to the Virgin ; but now I believe in her no longer, for I believe in Christ. Let us have no more mass. These masses are only to increase the power and the purse of the priests. All masses are paid for at several prices, according to their quality. Virgil sang of the pains of purgatory, long before Christ was born. In China, Japan, India, and other Pagan countries, we find purgatory. The priests laugh at it, and talk of greasing their shoes to slide easily and quickly through.”

The Padre then described the fryings and roastings of purgatory, and recited several amusing stories respecting priests, devils, &c.

“If God has condemned souls to purgatory, how can he in his justice let them out for the saying of masses by other persons ? The thing is absurd. Purgatory is not in the Bible—to introduce it the Papists were forced to bring the book of Maccabees into their Bible.”

After the *Benediction*, the Padre said a few words respecting the new Italian chapel, projected by some friends of the evangelical operations of the reverend gentleman. The Father gave notice that during the week lists would be circulated to see if a congregation could be found sufficiently large to make it worth while to build the chapel in question. We are happy

to be able to announce that this project, thanks to the efforts of Father Gavazzi, and a few other philanthropic spirits, is in a fair way of being consummated. This is but the commencement of a series of practical results to accrue to the Italians in America, from the mission of Father Gavazzi.

After he had concluded his regular course of Lectures in New York, the Father paid a visit to Baltimore, where he experienced considerable opposition from "high quarters"—that city being known to contain within it a very wealthy, powerful, and active Roman Catholic influence, daily spreading and growing stronger. All kinds of petty annoyances and obstructions were thrown in his way—and it was even not without considerable difficulty that a room was obtained for the Lectures. However, he finally succeeded, and delivered two Lectures there, which were attended by crowded audiences, and received with most enthusiastic demonstrations of approbation.

Returning from Baltimore, in accordance with his promise, the regular course of the Lectures in New York—those which we now present to the public—was repeated. The attendance and enthusiasm on each occasion, showed that the metropolis was still under the spell of the Father's eloquence, and that he had produced a powerful impression upon all thinking minds.

Of course, all these events had not passed without exciting the fears and the vigilance of the Papists and Jesuits, against whom his attacks were aimed. Taking advantage of the facile *mobocracy* of New York—a power evoked by the Papists themselves from the lowest and most ignorant class of our foreign population—a regularly organized attempt was made to hiss down Father Gavazzi, break up his Lectures, and drive him from the city. Thanks to the firmness of the Father himself, and the prompt and hearty co-operation of the authorities to preserve order, these nefa-

rious designs were entirely defeated. On one or two occasions, some disturbance occurred, which was soon quelled, and the Lectures proceeded as if nothing had happened. It is not *yet* in this country that the free expression of opinion can be put down; and the result of the efforts of the Papists and their ignorant brutal tools, to put down Father Gavazzi, has only been to increase his popularity, and consequently, the benefit of his labors.

After the Lectures in New York were concluded, the Father received numerous and pressing invitations to visit and lecture in other places in the neighborhood. To most of these he was compelled to return reluctant denials; but, yielding to the personal solicitations of many respectable and influential citizens, he at length consented to postpone his departure for another week, for the purpose of lecturing in Brooklyn, Jersey City, and Williamsburgh. On every occasion on which he appeared, he created the greatest enthusiasm, and, evidently made, by his Lectures, the profoundest impression. We do not give even a sketch of these lectures, as they are contained almost literally in the full report of the regular series of Lectures at the Tabernacle, contained in this volume.

Invited by a deputation from Philadelphia, Father Gavazzi left New York for that city, where he lectured for five successive nights. The subjects of his Lectures must of course be the same in all places, for he has but one object to obtain in every country, that is, to enlighten the Catholic population as to the evils and perversions of the Church of Rome, and to warn the Protestant population of the increasing power of Rome and her Jesuit priests in nations where hitherto Protestantism has been dominant. But the Father's eloquence, founded on inspiration arising from sincere and profound conviction, gives the charm of novelty to every one of his Lectures, though the subject may not vary. His audiences in Philadelphia were even more

numerous than in New York. The most enlightened citizens of Philadelphia followed his arguments with the greatest interest, for at this moment the Jesuits are making unheard-of efforts in the Quaker city to obtain the direction of all public schools, and to exclude from them the reading of the Scriptures.

The press of Philadelphia spoke in the most enthusiastic terms of Father Gavazzi.

The *Sun* and *Bulletin* went so far as to call his mission the advent of a second Messiah, for he comes to save the people from mental slavery and death. Philadelphia was ground already consecrated to the cause of anti-Popery; and from the first moment of opening his lips there, the Father appeared to be inspired with even more than his wonted enthusiasm. In his first lecture, on the subject of the prohibition of the Bible, he said—

“ If the Church of Rome prohibits the reading of the Gospel, it is the Church apostate from the Gospel. It is no more the Church of Christ—it is the Church of anti-Christ. Perhaps it will be said, if in ancient times the Church prohibited the reading of the Bible, it is more liberal to-day. But if the Church of Rome to-day is liberal towards Catholics living among Protestants, this dispensation proves that there was before a prohibition—therefore this liberality is one of the strongest proofs of the prohibition of the Bible in other times. But is it true that among the Roman Catholics of this country they enjoy the free reading of the Bible? The priests do not read the Bible from the pulpit. They do not advise the people to read their Bible at home. No, never. And, therefore, the license to read is only a mere license, and intended to deceive the Protestants. By the bulls of Sixtus VI. and Clement VII. the Roman Catholics are prohibited from reading the Bible without license—not verbally, but in writing. License for reading the Word of God! and, without license, if I read the Bible in a vernacular

tongue, I commit a mortal sin, and cannot be absolved by my confessor ! License ! I have the command of God, and need no other license. Christ never said in the Gospel, Go and search the bulls of the Popes, or the pastorals, or the bishops, but said, Go and search the Scriptures. St. Paul never said, Go read the works of Alphonso Liguori or Ignatius de Loyola. And, therefore, if popes, cardinals, bishops, and Jesuits prohibit the reading of the Bible, and God and Christ command me on the other side, I will obey God, and disobey popes, and cardinals, and Jesuits.

“ We have the proposition plainly proved that the popes prohibit the Bible ; but we have another party who say the popes grant license to read the Bible. But what Bible ? The pope will thus escape the accusation, but it is so easy, in the papal system, to unite truth and falsehood, that you cannot be surprised at this. The Bible read at present in the papal system, is a really corrupted Bible. The apocryphal books are introduced, by which many errors of the church seem authorized. But we oppose the intrusion of the apocryphal books which were introduced in the Council of Trent. This Council was composed of fifty-three prelates, and therefore it was said to be a General Council, representing the whole Church. But we disclaim the apocryphal books, and will call ourselves Christians, and the fathers of the council apostates. The ancient Jews never admitted the apocryphal books among the canonical books, according to Josephus. More, the primitive Church of Christ never admitted the apocryphal books. The Council of Laodicea absolutely rejected them, and the Council of Constantinople confirmed that. Generally speaking, the fathers rejected and excluded the apocryphal books. Eusebius and Jeronymus were among them, and therefore we exclude these books, not because we are Protestants, but because we are Christians of the primitive Church. The Councils are infallible and immu-

table. Very well. The Councils of Laodicea and Constantinople excluded these books, and therefore, according to them, we reject them. Oh! said the Council of Trent, you must admit them. Who is infallible—who lies? The Councils of Laodicea and Constantinople, or that of Trent? This is the first alteration and corruption in the Bible, because many great errors are supported by the book of the Maccabees. But there is also a real corruption in the Bible. Take, for example, the Latin vulgate. Before the Council of Trent, Augustine rose to reproach Jeronymus for many errors in his translation. Afterwards the translation was much altered by the amanuenses, so that Sixtus V. was obliged to alter it; and he said, "I have corrected this vulgate of many thousands of errors." After a few years, Clement VII. published a bull, recalling all the copies of Sixtus V., stating that he found two thousand errors, which he had corrected. This is said by Clement VII. in his preface. Now the Douay Bible was translated before the alterations of Sixtus V., so that it contains all the errors altered by Sixtus V. and Clement VII. Now, not quoting Protestant books, but a Papist authority, I can prove the Romish Bible to be horribly corrupt. One of my old Barnebite brethren wrote, a few years ago, a book, published in Rome, revised by the Inquisition, in which book he said that he found, in the present vulgate, not less than seven hundred and fifty capital errors. This is stated by a Romish monk, in Rome. Now, this is the Bible read by the Catholics—the Word corrupted, expressly by popes. I have the authority of Clement VII. that purposely many things which ought to be changed, were not changed, and many things added not from the Word of God. I can say that from Genesis to the Revelations the Bible is corrupted. In the text "He shall crush the serpent's head," the Romish Bible has introduced the word "she." The text where Christ said, "I shall send my Holy Spirit

to you to teach you what I have said," is altered from the preterit into the future, "what I shall say," so as to permit the popes to introduce any new dogmas. The text where Paul directs that a bishop shall be the husband of one wife, is made to convey the meaning that he shall have only one diocese, as the diocese is his wife. Who composed the Councils? Men who wrote the bulls—men who are the holy fathers—men who are the ascetical writers of the Papal system—all men. And will I substitute the fallibility of men for the infallibility of God! Oh, no! I can be safe without pope and councils, and ascetical writers, but I cannot be safe without God. The Roman Catholic Church claims infallibility by apostolical traditions. According to them, many of the apostolical traditions are superior to the Word of God.

"I have nothing to answer when my Roman Catholic brethren believe traditions superior to the Bible—liberty to all. Believe, my dear brethren, in traditions, but I will believe in the Bible. Is that according to Clement and Eusebius, when the heretics cannot find in the Word of God proof for their heresies, they find it in the apostolical traditions; and therefore the Church of Rome is an heretical church. The Papal system will have a foundation in the traditions of Papia when it is favorable to them; but when the contrary is the case, it rejects Papia—so that Papia is a very good writer when he is favorable to the Church of Rome, but he believes too much when he is unfavorable. I will admit some apostolical tradition, not as a foundation for faith, but as an inspiration. But we have apostolical traditions against the Word of God. Christ said, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the body," so that the true Christian can eat flesh and fish indifferently; but the Church of Rome prescribed some particular food on Friday and Saturday in Ember week, or in Lent. To obey the Word of God and tradition is impossible. If you believe the

Bible, you cannot err ; but if you believe the tradition, then you must disbelieve the Bible. We cannot be saved by the souls of our priests, but by our own merits. I cannot commit the food of my body to any other ; I must eat and drink for myself. It is the same with the Word of God. Christ never said, "I commit to the priests the reading of the Scriptures ;" but he ordered all to read the Scriptures. Remember what I say—Pope and Satan are perfectly equal. You will say it is too much. I will prove my proposition. The first corrupter of the Word of God in Paradise was Satan ; the first corrupter of the Word of God in the Church of Christ was the Pope—and therefore Pope and Satan are equal. But Satan is always bad, and never changing, and the Pope is always bad, and never changing—so my proposition is proved. All the last Popes have been prohibiting the Word of God, namely—Pius VII., Leo X., Gregory XVII., and Pio Nono. My conclusion for this evening is—I can say finally, look on the Continent ; what are the Papist nations without the Bible ? Nothing. What are the Protestant nations with it ? Look at Switzerland, England, Germany, France, the United States. With the Bible, and Bible alone, the American people will flourish ; and I will say to them, remember it was the Bible, and the Bible alone, which made your freedom."

The speaker concluded his lecture by warning the American people against the insidious attempts of the Jesuits to subvert their national school system. That the Church of Rome is never satisfied. Grant them one thing to-day, and to-morrow they demand a second, and again a third, and so on until they have attained their highest hopes, and glutted their selfish ambition.

- His closing remarks were in answer to Archbishop Hughes's letter on the Madiat question, in which reply he refuted the argument of the Bishop, that the Roman Catholic Church promotes the reading of the Scriptures.

This first lecture fully roused the cool and cautious Philadelphians, and from that evening, during his stay there, he was an object of constant attention. His second Lecture was thronged with an audience embracing a greater amount of intellect, character, and influence than is often gathered in one assembly. His Lecture on this occasion was on the Supremacy of the Pope. In his usual friendly, affectionate style, he began—

“My dear brethren, the first proposition for us to solve this evening is, Does there exist any such supremacy in spiritual matters? The second question is, Was St. Peter appointed the head of the Church, and if Pio the Ninth is the successor, regularly speaking, of St. Peter?

“We shall see by the Bible that spiritual supremacy is a folly. Was there a supremacy among the Apostles? Yes, for Christ gave to Peter the key. But that meant merely the preaching, and was not given to Peter exclusively, but to all the Apostles. Christ, after his resurrection, said to all—‘I give to you the power of the key of heaven.’ Therefore, the same words were equally said to all the Apostles as to Peter. Peter was rather impetuous in his manner, and when Christ asked if they knew who he was, Peter answered for them all, and therefore we have no supremacy at all. Peter, it is true, spoke first among others. He was rather an Italian apostle. Peter was answering to the question of Christ; and Christ said to him particularly, I shall give to you the key of heaven, or the preaching of the Gospel; and Peter was the first to preach. He was sent to preach; and at present no bishop or archbishop can send the Pope to preach the Gospel. And, finally, you find Peter reproached by Paul; but at present no man can reproach the Pope, for if he is a weak man, and neglects the salvation of the whole world, nobody can reproach

the Pope for his weakness and sin. This is the canon law, my brethren.

"We have, therefore, no supremacy at all, for the supremacy of the Pope is the Word of God. The only text they have is that from the sixteenth chapter of Matthew. 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.' But I maintain that in this case *Petrus* is not in the nominative case. But Peter was a man. If the church was built on Peter, the Church of Rome is no longer a divine church, but a human one. So, in another place, Peter is called Satan, and if the Church of Rome is built on Peter, it is a Satanic church; and thirdly, as Peter was a perjurer, then if the Church of Rome was built on him, the Church of Rome is a perjured church. 'Thou art Peter,' said Christ, 'and on this rock'—what is this rock? Not Peter, but the confession of Peter. I defy all Roman Catholic divines to find a point of controversy in which all the holy fathers agree.

"Now, what is the rock in the estimation of the holy fathers? Saint Hilary, in the sixth book of the Holy Trinity, said, 'The building of the church is on Peter's confession; this is the foundation of the church.' Saint Ambrose says, 'The foundation of the church is the faith of Peter, for it was said, "not to the flesh of Peter, but to the faith of Peter—the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and therefore the rock is not Peter, and therefore the Church of Christ is built, not on Peter, but on the faith of Peter.' Now, what is the rock? Christ himself is the rock on which the church was built. Saint Jeronymus said, 'Christ is the rock, who granted to his Apostles to be called, also, rocks,' and on this he agrees with Augustine, for he says, 'Peter is from *petra*, rock, and not *petra* from Peter; therefore Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church—on this rock which you have confessed;" that is to

say, on the living Son of God, for I shall build you, Peter, on myself, and not myself on you, Peter.'

"After such explanation, I must conclude that the rock on which the Christian Church is built is not Peter, but Christ himself. Generally speaking, two heads in business are bad. It is necessary, for good rule, to have one head. Christ in heaven—the Pope on earth. Heaven and earth are very different; and, perhaps, between Christ and the Pope there is a little difference; and really between the precepts of Christ and the precepts of the Pope there is a little difference. (Laughter.) And, therefore, I cannot conceive a church with two heads so different, and if I must exclude either of them, I prefer to exclude the Pope. Christ promised to be with the church to the end of the world, and that promise alone can support the church, and therefore I can, and must, reject the visible head. The church is a body. Imagine a body with two heads—it must be a vile, bad body. The Austrian eagle has two heads, and oh, it is a vile, vile body. (Applause.)

"We must have only one head, and we would be very well satisfied with one good head. St. Paul, figuratively and beautifully speaking, said Christ is to his Church what the husband is to his wife; but in no code, ancient or modern, have you a wife with two husbands. If a wife has another man nearer than a husband, the other man, what is he? You know. So, by the intrusion of the Pope into the church as the second husband, what is he, my dear brethren? If, by the New Testament, you cannot find good authority for the supremacy of the Pope, then, even if Pius IX. is the successor of Saint Peter, he is only by that Bishop of Rome. But was Saint Peter ever at Rome? What proof have you to say he was? No, he was not, because the Word of God was against the coming of St. Peter to Rome. His deeds are fully recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, but they don't say he was at

Rome. St. Peter never was at Rome, because St. Paul, in writing, does not mention him at all, and when he wrote to the Philippians, from Rome, he said the only man who worked for God was Timotheus; and therefore, by the Word of God, St. Peter was never at Rome.

"But, they say, we have monuments at Rome which attest Peter's presence there. Cardinal Wiseman said, in his lecture, that the worship of the Chair of St. Peter in the Basilica at Rome, is evidence that he must have been there. But is it not possible that that chair was carried into Rome from some other place? Oh, thank God, our good Cardinal Wiseman spoke very clearly. It was examined thirty years ago, by two French priests, who referred its manufacture to the fifth century, and thought it was the chair of some of the Emperors in the decadence of the Roman Empire. If this chair was made five hundred years after the death of St. Peter, then St. Peter was never seated on it. This is a mathematical proof, and at the present moment this chair is in the Vatican as an object of worship. Now, there is not, by the Divine Book, nor by the history of the church, any authority for the supremacy of the Pope.

"But, my friends, there has been discovered another chair, which is said to be intimately connected with St. Peter. Upon a critical examination of the chair by eminent oriental professors, they saw upon the seat an inscription taken from the Koran; but this, my friends, is not the only relic blended by tradition with the ministry of St. Peter at Rome.

"The Church of Rome, remember, base their most cogent argument, upon the assertion that St. Peter was infallible; and as the Pope was the successor of St. Peter, the Pope must of necessity be infallible.

"But St. Peter was only a man, and possessed the weakness of men; he denied Christ three times, and fell from his former estate; and therefore he was not

infallible. 'But,' says the Church of Rome, 'he was infallible in the last time, when Christ promised to him so clearly that "the gates of hell should not prevail against the church built upon this rock."' This is true. The gates of hell will never prevail against the church; but the church is not St. Peter. The rock is Christ himself. But they say that Peter is infallible, because Christ promised to be unto Peter the consummation of all good. But this proves only that Christ will be also with His Church, present to His Church, preserving and maintaining His Church against all temptations, and all snares of his enemies. So that the Scriptures do not prove at all that St. Peter was infallible. Poor St. Peter! He was a very good man, and a strong, warm-hearted Apostle; but he was also a man—he was a man when he denied Christ in passion.

"Infallibility is a Divine attribute, and St. Peter was not infallible; and therefore his successors are not infallible. But is the present Pope the successor of St. Peter? I maintain that the present Pope is *not* the successor of St. Peter at all; because, in order to be his successor, it is necessary to suppose that St. Peter was a Bishop, and that he resided at Rome. But there is no evidence to prove that he was a Bishop, or that he ever was at Rome. This is the only conclusion at which we can arrive by Scripture, by reason, or by nature. In the Acts of the Apostles, where is traced the life of Paul and Peter, you have St. Paul at Rome, but St. Peter, never. Four instances are mentioned of St. Paul having been at Rome, but not one of St. Peter. We will not receive St. Peter at Rome by *tradition*, but only by Scripture. Bring us testimony from the Bible, and we will then believe it.

"Again, we are told by Cardinal Wiseman, who is looked on as the very best authority, that St. Peter ~~was~~ at Rome, because the *Chair* of St. Peter is in

Rome. This famous chair was made in Venice some four hundred years subsequent to the birth of St. Peter, and was transported by some merchants from Constantinople, so that, in the natural order of things, St. Peter could not very well have occupied it.

"Remember, the present Pope claims infallibility because he is successor of St. Peter in the Bishopric of Rome. But remember also, that as St. Peter never was at Rome, therefore Pius IX. is not his successor. (Applause.) Is Pius the Ninth a Pope? You are not certain that he is a real Pope. In order to have a real Pope, it is necessary to have a Bishop before; and in order to have a Bishop it is necessary to have a Priest. Now, you are not certain that Pius IX. was rightly ordained a Bishop. You have only supposition on this point—not certainty.

"I therefore conclude that he is not the successor of St. Peter, and therefore he is not infallible. Christ said—'I am the way, the light, and the word;' and therefore Christ is the only infallible one. But to reduce all arguments of the Church of Rome to one, we have this argument, 'I am infallible because I *am* infallible.' (Applause.) This is the brief of their argument. Furthermore, the Church of Rome says the Bible may be variously interpreted, and therefore is not infallible. Well, what do they propose to substitute for the Bible. Oh, the *Brevarium*, the Canon Laws, and the Popish Bulls. But if the people take these works as guides they will be led into darkness. It will be like the blind leading the blind—both may fall into a pit. According to the creed of Pius IV., the Church of Rome believes in the Bible, and receives its present interpretation as true; still they deny the divinity of Christ, and his resurrection."

But we have no room to continue these cursory sketches of the fugitive Addresses of the Father, and will no longer detain the reader from the regular series of Lectures, which he has carefully prepared and

digested, and the interest of which will be enhanced by the foretaste we have already given.

After his return from Philadelphia, Father Gavazzi delivered one more Address in Italian to his countrymen, and then departed for Canada, in compliance with urgent invitations received from there, and where he is at the moment these pages are passing through the press.

LECTURES.

LECTURES

OF

FATHER GAVAZZI.

[REPORTED BY T. C. LELAND.]

LECTURE I.

THE IDENTITY OF ROMANISM AND PAGANISM.

My subject this evening is, Romanism and Paganism are the same. We will first speak about some things, so that we can distinguish in what especially consists the Paganism of the present Roman system. Before beginning, allow me to give notice to my friends that I will speak on Sunday evening at the Tabernacle. The subject here, to-morrow evening, will be an important one. We are to speak about our common friends—namely, the Jesuits, my dear brethren. I suppose that to-morrow evening the weather will be a *little* more favorable. This evening is such a night as what we generally call in Italy the “conscience of the Jesuits.”

It is necessary to say that the Romish Church is not out of salvation, because she has Christ as the foundation. Certainly it was possible for the Popish system to cast away Christ. I am certain that at present Christ would no longer consent to be of the Church of Rome; but it was not so easy to cast away Christ; so that Romanism still ostensibly maintains its faith in Christ.

But it is not the true faith in Christ; because in the Popish system you know better than I can say, justification is not through Christ, but through the merits of mortal creatures; so that the rule and principle of the Popish system is justification by works. But the apostolic powers say that our foundation is Christ. It is necessary to build upon this foundation, called the cornerstone. It is necessary to build on the pure Christianity of the gospel. If a man build upon this foundation, in wood and in the flesh, its walls will be tried by fire. This is the case with the Church of Rome. Upon Christ the Popish system erects all sorts of superstitions. Instead of building upon Christ the pure religion of the gospel, it builds only the pure religion of *isma*—namely, pure Paganism. So that I am right when I say that I respect the individuals in the Popish system; because, generally speaking, they know nothing of the work of faith in Christ, wherever the Popish system is dominant.

But my hard feelings are against the *Romish priesthood*, and the *Popish system*, which know very well that they build with wood and the flesh, and with bad materials, and not upon the true matter, namely, Christ. So that I say that the Popish system may possibly procure the salvation of many thousands; and I hope that all the Christians in the Popish system may be saved. But as they make salvation dependant on works of supererogation, and through the commandments of the Church; and as those works are too numerous, so it is very difficult to obtain eternal salvation in the Popish system—because, the more you multiply commandments, the more you multiply laws, the less the commandments and the laws are observed. Therefore, according to the best preachers among the Romanists—according to their very saints—only one in each thousand is saved. It is not my assertion; but such a thing was said in a moment of intense extasy, by St. John Chrysostom, preaching, not in a primitive Church of Christ, but in the Church which was then becoming a Pagan Church. This was the conviction of St. Chrysostom. And now it is repeated by the majority of Romish preachers, that only one in a thousand is saved among Romanists. Then my conclusion is a good thing—is a Christian work—to

drive the Romanists, my dear brethren, to engage in war, and battle against this faith. My system is, not to put peace, but to put division, between error and darkness, and light and truth—between God and Satan.

Having spoken something about my respect for the individuals, and my firm belief that many among them may be and will be saved, now we will examine some of the reasons which show that the Popish system includes within it, Paganism. I assign especially three; 1st. At the time of Constantine, when Christianity was imposed upon the Pagan world, then Paganism introduced itself into the Church of Christ. Before this time the choice of religion was free; but after that time Constantine made laws, especially one—that nobody should be a soldier in the Imperial army without being a Christian. Then being a Christian was an obligation assumed merely to please the Emperor, to enjoy the right to obtain power and success in the world. So that I firmly believe that this was the first epocha in which the Church of Christ became apostate from the gospel, and the true following of Christ. Therefore the great multitude of Pagans flow into the Church, bringing with them their Pagan customs, their Pagan practices, their Pagan idols. We have an example in the Inspired Book, where the beautiful Rachel became the wife of Jacob, and became exiled from Laban, and took with her the idols of her father, which she introduced into the house of Jacob. This same thing took place in the time of Constantine. The greatest part of the Pagans became Christians, but having no very strong persuasion of the truth of their new creed, and not having free choice, they became Christians, many of them, only in appearance, while at heart they remained Pagans, in secret worshipping their idols and their gods. But the church did not prevent this sacrilege.

And now my second reason. I suppose that the Church at this time thought to fit the old fashion of Paganism into the garb of Christianity—but it was not able to eradicate such peculiar and deep-rooted idolatries; and I suppose that finally, the Church itself remained no more the pure Church of Christ. I suppose there was a little vanity in this—a spirit of ambition—

to have many millions of Christians, without looking to it that they were good Christians. For myself, I have an opinion that it is best to have few and good, rather than many and bad. But this is not the opinion of the Church of Rome.

If you feel that I have exemplified my general proposition, thus far, we will proceed to the other reason.

The Romanists have what are called "missions." They continue assembled for twelve, fourteen, or twenty days, in the spiritual retreat to which they have been invited, and where they have preaching and religious exercises every day. At the end of the "mission," the missionaries desire that all the people approach the table of the Lord's Supper, namely the sacrament. But in order to have a great many people, they "confess" without insisting upon all the conditions. They confess people grossly, with a large profession of the goodness of God, and that in a time of general remission of sins, they are easily pardoned. I have, from my own particular knowledge, known many hearty Christians, not satisfied with such a confession, come to me to confess again their sins, to render an account, and satisfy their conscience. What does this prove? It proves that they were very easy confessors. It proves that, in order to have two thousand or five thousand people approaching the sacrament, these confessors passed over many gross sins; and, secondly, it proves that they desire to secure public praise among the Protestant communicants themselves. That is what I call a little vanity. This is no longer the Christian primitive church, but is becoming the Pagan Church. The church was tolerating the introduction of Paganism among Christians.

But the last, and perhaps the strongest argument, is the consent, or rather the approval, of the Church of Rome, by which Paganism was introduced among Christians. My dear brethren, do not suppose the Church of Rome, when she became apostate from the Church of Christ, was a blind and foolish one. Oh, no! She knew very well that Paganism was profitable to the ancient priests; and she knew, too, that she could make it profitable to the new priesthood of Christ. So that, according to the great French writer Bossuet—the real head, I suppose, of the

Gallican clergy—when it was an independent clergy, the first clergy, perhaps, in Europe, but is so no more, because it is buried now in ignorance—a servile clergy—then, at the time of Bossuet, this great writer said, that “Christianity is all one piece;” but Papacy is composed of many pieces, in many different ages, by many different men. So that you know by history the names and the words different Popes introduced into the church—especially the different Pagan ordinances. Therefore, I say, in the present Popish system, Paganism is the most profitable aid in support of the authority—and the pocket—of the Popish priest. And, therefore, the conclusion of this part of our subject is—that, at the present day, the Popish Church is no more the church of the gospel, but is the church of heathenism. Thus is the gospel of Christ—the spiritual gospel of Christ—the divine gospel of Christ—“transubstantiated” into the flesh and the blood of the ancient Pagan practices.

Now, in order to go on perspicuously in this lecture, do not look upon me in the light of a friend, or as an orator, but simply as a foreign lecturer. I shall now prove this proposition, under three heads—gods, priests, and things. I begin by a consideration of the gods of Paganism. The ancients had many hundreds and thousands of gods. According to St. Augustine, they had in the city of God—in Rome alone—not less than twenty-two thousand different gods. They have not only twenty-two thousand different gods; but, according to martyrology, a hundred thousand gods, in the Church of Rome. That is to say, they have not less than a hundred thousand saints among the Romans—and these saints are really in place of the ancient gods of Paganism. We have in the ancient Paganism the *Presidæ*, gods which preside; Isis and Osiris among the Egyptians; Vulcan in Lemnos; Belus for the Babylonians, and many others, among Pagans. We have in the Romish Church, St. Denis, the patron saint of France; St. Stephen of Hungary; and St. Patrick of Ireland. We have no nation in the Romish world which does not enjoy its particular patron saint. Among these patron saints of Paganism we have the *tutelaries*, who preside over towns; we have Juno, who was supposed to preside over Carthage;

Minerva over Athens; and Apollo, who presided over Delphos. No town in ancient Paganism was without its patron god; and now we have no town among the Romanists which has not its particular patron saint. My native city, Milan, has its San Carlos Boronio. Naples has its San Giovanni; in short, no Romish town or city is without its patron saint. Among the gods of the ancients were the *patrones*—namely, the presiding divinity of an old tower or an old temple. We have the great Diana of Ephesus; we have Venus in Patros; we have Jupiter in Dodona. They had among all the ancient peoples deities called house-patrons, the Lares and Penates. There were in ancient Rome over twenty thousand of these.

I have something upon this point to say of the churches here in this city. Every church in New York is consecrated to some particular saint. You have your St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Jude, St. Bridget, and I know not how many others. I have something to say of this abuse, too, among Protestants. I am sorry to say that this innovation is becoming too much the practice among even Protestants; I don't like "St. Mary," as a dedication among Protestants. This is not to-day my subject, however, but it will perhaps be so another time.

Now, if you should enter into the mass-houses among the Romanists, you would see many altars at which are celebrated different masses—so that here, at this altar, Christ is offered up to the Father; on the other side, Christ is offered to the eternal Father, translated into the flesh and blood of Christ. So that in the same church you have two, three, or four repetitions of the same rite, going on at once—four or five different Christs! Another altar is dedicated to St. Joseph, &c., &c. I have not seen any of the Catholic churches in this town—but I shall see them—I am not afraid. I was a day or two ago in Baltimore. My friends said, "don't go to Baltimore—there are so many Romanists in Baltimore." I did not fear; I went to Baltimore. There I went into several Catholic churches,—some very good, some not very good—American style—one of them was dedicated to St. Paul. At the left hand of the entrance is the altar to the Virgin Mary, in marble. A marble statue of the Virgin Mary,

with a marble baby in her arms—this is all. In another place is another Virgin Mary, in picture, which opens its breast and shows the heart—the “*immaculate*” heart—of the Virgin Mary—in a picture. I say this is more than Pagan—because the Pagans had an altar dedicated to but one Juno, one Minerva, one Ceres, &c., while here are two Virgin Marys on two different altars. Now which of these is the true one?—the Virgin Mary in marble, or the Virgin Mary in picture? This, I say, is going a little beyond Paganism. But I don’t know but some of my auditors have been in Italy, where we have a church dedicated to Saint Nicolas. The guardian saint of this church is Saint Cherris (Ceres); and in the church are five altars, with seven pictures of the saint at each altar.

Now to conclude this part of my lecture. We have among the Pagans, what I shall speak of more fully another time—some rural deities—rustic divinities. Others were called *semiales viales*, deities who presided over grounds and gardens. Among the Romanists we find the same thing—not, perhaps, in America. In Protestant countries Romanists have more prudence—so that, as in our country, every church is dedicated absolutely to some man; here, in order to deceive you, it is dedicated to God, *in honor* of St. Peter, or St.-so-and-so. So, also, in your country, you do not enjoy the saints of the garden and the field; but in Italy, as you walk along the road, you see an image on every tree. The road—is it a railroad? No! No railroads in Italy! But along the road side, wherever you find a tree, you see a little image of St. Mary, and a bench on which the devotees can kneel. As you pass, you take off your hat, in honor of the rural god. This is what I call Paganism in the church; because, you don’t find images of Christ, and even not many crucifixes—but all images are of the Virgin Mary, and of different saints. Therefore, all are gods, instead of Christ. This is Paganism introduced into the bosom of the Church of Christ.

But we have not only the ancient gods introduced into the Church, but our modern gods have even the names and attributes of their Pagan prototypes—certainly not always, but in

some instances. So great were the exigencies of the Church, and so strong its desire to pardon and convert the Pagans, and turn them into saints, that we find among the Church such saints as St. Ceres (Cherries,) St. Diana, St. Faunus, St. Satyrus, &c. You know the attributes of these saints! We have many others—even St. Bacchus, the patron saint of the drunkards, my dear brethren! I said, in another lecture, the Romanists attribute special functions to their different saints. They have a saint for almost every distress and misery of human life. We have patron saints to protect us against the tooth-ache; a patron saint for the ear-ache; for pain in the breast, the lips, and for every kind of human infirmity. These features, we shall see, are all drawn from the Pagans—who had their deities, also, for every function and accident of human life. I will quote an illustration of this, begging you, on account of its aptness, to excuse its ludicrousness. In ancient times there was a temple dedicated to Romulus, on the spot where it was supposed he was suckled by a wolf. Now on the anniversary of the discovery of Romulus and Remus, the nurses had a custom of carrying their babies to the temple of Romulus, and of putting them over the altar, so that Romulus should become their patron, and help them during their infancy. The poor nurses of Rome, when it came under Constantine, were in despair—having no longer this beautiful custom of bringing out their babies, and displaying all their fine linen and dresses. In pity for the disappointment of the poor nurses, the Church of Rome gave them a new patron; and instead of the temple of Romulus, we have still the same identical temple, but it is changed in name, and dedicated to St. Theodorus, who is now the patron saint of babies, as Romulus was before. So that, on the anniversary of St. Theodorus you may still see a long procession of pretty nurses, with their babies,—which they put over the altar of St. Theodorus, that he may take them into his favor. I suppose that St. Theodorus generally consents to adopt these babies—however, I don't know,—it not being my business to be among the nurses.

I say, this is the same custom that existed in the time of

Paganism: the same temple and the same practice still exist among the Romanists—and that, too, with the same power.

Now, oh goodness help me! if you enter any church, especially in Rome and Naples, in the neighborhood of the Vatican and the Bourbon Museum, you see tablets devoted to the mementoes of wonderful and miraculous cures performed upon poor people who believed. In the Pagan temples these mementoes were, some in painting—more in brass—in the form of eyes, hands, lips, feet, presented to the ancient gods by those who had recovered their health. But, my dear brethren, if you enter a Roman Catholic Church, you will also see some eyes, arms, legs, breasts, &c., hanging on the walls, which have been offered by the devotees of the patron saint. What is the conclusion? Why, that these are the same gods as those of the Pagan miracles, and that there is the same devotion to them among the Romanists as among the Pagans. But the ancient gods were also powerful in another thing—in apparitions. We have the great apparition of Castor and Pollux to the Roman general, in which they promised a great victory, and a great victory followed. We have a similar apparition in the time of Pope Leo X, when King Attila was approaching Rome. We have another extraordinary apparition of St. Peter and St. Paul, with two drawn swords, appearing against Attila, so that he was stopped from entering Rome. I know St. Peter and St. Paul never used swords; but now that they are in heaven, they enjoy this privilege.

The lecture this evening is only for the purpose of drawing a parallel between Pagans and Christians among the Romanists. We find that when an ancient Roman was desirous of becoming a god, he applied to a certain Julius Proculus, and said, "I wish to be worshipped by the Romans, and to be called Quirinus." And afterwards Romulus became a god, called Quirinus. We read that, at the time of the Emperor Theodosius, Gamaliel, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, was applied to by the high priest to make saints of Stephen and three others. The matter was referred to the Bishop of Jerusalem, and finally, St. Stephen was honored with a particular worship, by the numerous sect who buried him, with tears and lamentations. But they did not wor-

ship Stephen at all. Afterwards Rome claimed the body of St. Stephen, and it was buried with that of St. Laurence, in Rome, in the basilica of St. Laurence. The people still believe that St. Stephen and St. Laurence sleep together in the same tomb. But when any one asks the Pope for permission to inspect the tomb, to see if really the two bodies rest together in the same sepulchre,—my dear brethren, the Popes never permit *that* sepulchre to be opened! Why? Because, they fear to find nothing in the sepulchre.

That's not all. We have Dionysius; we have the appearance of Hercules in Cythia, who left the impression of his feet on a stone—and this stone was worshipped in the ancient Paganism, with great devotion and ardor. What have we to correspond with this in Rome? We have the stone on which are impressed the two foot-prints of our divine Saviour, at the moment of leaving this earth, ascending to the right hand of his heavenly father. We have many stones impressed with the feet of many saints—especially in Ireland. We have also in Italy, stones impressed with the feet of the Virgin Mary; and she also created a new well-spring of water, leaving her feet impressed upon a stone near whence it sprung. The people really believe it was the feet of the Virgin Mary which impressed the stone. It is so easy—not for me, because I have not the profession at command—it is so easy for a sculptor, in two hours, to make the impress of two feet in a stone, and to say the Virgin Mary descended and left her foot-prints beautifully stamped in the rock! Among the great apparitions with the Pagans, was the appearance of harpies, as described by Virgil. In order to be a saint or god, among the Pagans, some supernatural apparition was essential. Sometimes an eagle was made use of, which was made to appear flying over the funeral pile of the dead emperor. This was a sign that the emperor was worthy of becoming a god. In the ancient times, the Pagan priests were really kind to the emperors, and after death, emperors always became gods. Heliogabalus, Dioclesian, and the most horrible among the emperors, by the kindness of the priesthood, became saints or gods. I do not say this is the universal case, because many among the ancients were good

men. We have especially Pope Gregory VII., Hildebrand, and St. Pius V.; but of these, we speak more especially of Gregory VII. I do not now speak of his law concerning the Countess Matilda. But the worst trait in him was his ambitious aim to become the high priest of mankind, and to give universal domination to the Church of Rome. Pius VII. became a saint because of his cruelty; and having many, many hundred victims, the Church of Rome found him worthy to be canonized. But in ancient times, to decide who should be sainted, was the business of the people—not with the Christians, but with the Pagans. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, canonization was done by the people. When Paracelsus deceived the people, they honored him with the title of saint. The maxim of St. Augustine is applicable to many others—that we honor with the title of saint, many whom we detest. The Romanist believes that in the time of St. Martin, the Bishop of Tours, in France, there was a sepulchre of a man called a great saint, who was worshipped by a special pilgrimage, from all parts of France, and this man appeared—stating that he was not in heaven, but amongst the devils in hell—so that St. Martin preached against this man, because he was no saint at all. But many worship as saints, now, those who are condemned to the flames of hell, by the church of God. To become a saint, now, is not so difficult as people may believe. A man has only to show himself to be a man of business. The question is only to have a hundred and twenty thousand dollars. If you have no hundred and twenty thousand dollars, and are the best Papist possible—even after three hundred years—you are only a stupid and obscure Papist. But if you have the hundred and twenty thousand dollars, you are a very good saint for the Church of Rome! Canonization is all gratis; but all the prelates of Rome, cardinals, and the *consultus*, enjoy many hundred pounds of good chocolate—they have many sweet sugar-plumbs. They have a picture of every new saint. They have many other things. But if you will prove a miracle, if you will prove yourself possessed of holiness in a heroic degree, it is necessary you pay for your canonization! It is expensive to become a saint! There were five or six people

made saints under Gregory's last canonization—so that if each one paid twenty-five thousand dollars, it amounted altogether to a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. They spent that sum when the Italian Saint Boromio was canonized—and when it was proposed to his father to make a saint of another of his sons, he replied, "My good father, it may be a very good thing to be a saint—but another one in my family, and I should be ruined." So, between the Pagan and the Romanist, miracles are performed and substantiated.

Now, to complete this part of my discourse, it is necessary to say something about pilgrimages. We make pilgrimages, as they do in India. We have great sanctuaries, and pilgrimages to them. I will not spend my words on a subject so clear; but we have the worship of images. I have one lecture, entitled "Images." I will only show a few similarities between the ancient gods and present saints. We have images sent, as if they had fallen, from heaven. We have the Palladium of Jupiter, and also many images that came from heaven. The image of the Virgin Mary was no work of men. It came directly from heaven. It is true, it is a very ugly image; but the angel-artist, perhaps, had not learned sculpture of Canova or Michael Angelo. We have also ancient images, clothed. Plutarch himself speaks of Dioysius. The images were dressed in different styles, and very fashionably, so that the Tertulians laugh at this practice, and say that their godships are dressed like ladies, in the best stuffs. If we go into Spain we may see the sanctuary of Loretto, where you may see the petticoats in linen, woollen, gold, silver, pearls, and every kind of stuff, embroidered by ladies and princesses—and even by the King of Spain himself. The good old King of Spain, who restored the Inquisition in 1821, to honor the Virgin Mary, instead of employing himself about the happiness of his people, embroidered a petticoat for the Virgin. I ask, is there not a perfect similarity between the ancient Pagan godships and the Roman godships? In Dodona you have some sacred things moving miraculously about, and pilgrims followed religiously from place to place.

Now there is a similar case in Romanism. Until the thir-

teenth century, the image of the Virgin was satisfied with its home in Nazareth, and remained there in peace. "Now that Mahommed II. has conquered me," said this image one day, "I will go away;" and accordingly it set off, and on the same night, with bag and baggage. She travelled from Galilee to Dalmatia. After a few months, she again does not like her quarters; the Illyrians did not suit her. "I will go to Italy." Accordingly, that same night the image crossed the blue Adriatic, then deposited itself, house and all, in the valley of Loretto. But having no view from there, in a few days it deposited itself on the hill of Loretto. And now pilgrims from all quarters came to visit this travelled house and image.

The great question was, whether this was the abode the Virgin had definitively adopted, or whether she would go elsewhere; but the Pope solved that doubt by declaring that, of course, she would stay in his states, where she was, because she produced to the Papal revenues seventy thousand dollars in offerings, etc. So you see that the Romanist miracles are but a repetition of the old Pagan miracles. Nay, even Catholic images, and attributes of saints and gods, are the same in both creeds.

In both these religions we have pontifex major and pontifex minor—the Pope of Catholicism representing the High Priest of Paganism. Nay, their very costumes are almost the same, as to form and color. The Emperor Caligula was the one who invented the ceremony of having his foot kissed. The great Seneca rose against this custom, as degrading. The Pope, or the Vicar of God, offers his foot to be kissed, and it is a great favor to be allowed to do it; and I once thought it a privilege to kiss the ugly foot of Gregory XVI. Christ never offered his foot to be kissed—therefore it is sure that this custom originates in Paganism, and not in Christianity.

From Paganism we have priests, corresponding to augurs. We have every description of priest represented by our various monks and friars, as the vestal virgins represented our nuns of Christianity.

In Paganism, mendicant priests were as annoying and rapa-

cious as in the present day—for Cicero proposes that for the good of the state they should be restricted to certain sects.

There were missionaries paid, too, to go and instruct priests in priestcraft—just as now they are sent by various Catholic sects. There are vestiges in ancient Rome, in Herculaneum, and Pompeii especially, of hollow statues in the temples, with traps underneath, admitting a priest, so that he might speak from within and deliver oracles, as though the statues spoke miraculously, as images are made to do in Catholicism. We have from Cicero and Dionysius the account that the statue of Diana wept at the time of a great calamity, and that the statue of Apollo wept three days and three nights. We have it recorded, too, that the Goddess of Fortune twice audibly asked for a temple. All miracles performed by trickery of priesthood, taught by one to the other.

So in Catholicism, the images of the Virgin shed tears at the approach of the first French invasion.

The Virgin, too, moved her eyes in the sight of a whole multitude in Rome, at the time of this same event. All these things are easily managed, as none but the priests have access to the back of these pictures, hung up against a thick wall. All these manœuvres are to increase the contributions of the faithful. For this purpose, too, to look more imposing, the priests study their dress. Christ sat down to the Last Supper in his own dress; the Apostles preached in their ordinary dress. The Pagan priesthood had fine, fanciful and brilliant dresses; so have the Romanists, to the greatest excess, varying in color and material. We have green, black, red and yellow, cashmere, velvet, silk, and every species of gold and silver embroidery. Red is the color of the Holy Ghost, White of the Virgin, and of all the sacraments of the church. White for the Sunday before Christmas, Green for the Sunday after Easter; Black for death, and the souls in purgatory.

The costumes for the great Pontifical mass are quite a sight, such as you can rarely see elsewhere. Your great national exhibition will offer nothing so gorgeous as the dress of the Pope. Your Crystal Palace is an exhibition of the industry of all na-

tions ; but St. Peter's in the Vatican, at the time of the Pontifical mass, is an exposition of the Christian priesthood of all nations. All this is to aggrandize themselves. The dresses of the Jesuit College (del Gesù), present dresses of all colors, and are so rich, both in material and embroidery, that they stand alone. If the Christian religion, pure and simple as it is, appealed to the heart and reason of the people, it would not need this pomp and show ; therefore, this cannot be the pure worship of Christ. Ladies have fine and variegated dresses to amuse themselves, and to please others ; but then they are ladies, and the church is surely not to be treated as a lady. If the church were pure and simple, it would need no drapery to hide its harmonious forms ; its gorgeous raiments are put on to conceal that the Church of Rome is but a skeleton, made up of Pagan bones.

Another similarity is in the incense and in the candles. This is a custom belonging equally to Paganism and Catholicism. It was the custom of the Pagan priests to light hundreds of wax candles before their idols. In Scripture the Egyptians are reproached for lighting candles : "Go ye, who light candles before your gods, because they need darkness and not light, for they have not eyes to see your necessities."

Candles are lighted before the Virgin and the saints ; you pay for them ; you buy them ; but you are no richer. But the priests are ! Holy water existed among Pagans, as it also does among the Roman Christians. We have holy father Tiber, Oceanides, Naiades, Neptune, and many other water and river gods. In India we have the river Ganges, an object of sacred worship ; and any one who can die with his feet in the Ganges is sure to go to Heaven. This is also the custom among Christians. It is said that when St. Paul had his head cut off, he made three leaps, and in each place where his feet touched, there sprang up a spring of water. Now the people go to drink this holy water, and dance and amuse themselves in the same time.

Now I shall speak of St. Patrick. The most absurd of ancient tradition did not equal that. Croesus presented two golden vases to the priests, so that they might serve to contain holy water, to

be sprinkled around to expurge sin. In the Pagan temples this sprinkling of holy water was customary; and now, in the Roman Catholic churches, the first thing on entering is the holy water. Great people dip the tip of their finger into this water; some people, the whole hand; and if you will believe me I have seen an unclean Irishman come and wash in the holy water. At a great festival, with so many dippings of hands, the water, dear brethren, gets to be as white and clear as—my cloak! Virgil tells us that Æneas sprinkled the bones of his companions with water, as a part of the funeral service. This, too, is the custom at Roman Catholic funerals. It is used among the Pagans for exorcism—holy water is used among the Catholics against the devil. The Pagans used either salt or fresh water—the Romanists use either salt or fresh water. We use holy water against all calamities, accidents, diseases, and sorrows. If you have a new coach, or a new anything, you sprinkle it with holy water.

-We have a festival called the Festival of St. Anthony. He is the saint who protects you against fire. Here, your patron saint is your Insurance Company, or your good firemen, and they, too, pour on water. In Naples they make great use of him, for they have no companies there. He is the patron saint of all beasts or cattle—that is, he prevents disease among them, more particularly of little pigs. Now, on the 17th January we have still the festival of St. Anthony in the Roman Catholic Church, the priest being dressed in full robes. Sometimes it is even a dignitary of the Church, who is seated on a bench near the relics of St. Anthony, as the representative of St. Anthony, with a vessel of holy water near him, and his breviary before him. All the oxen, mules, asses, and horses, pass before him, decked out as for a fête; and in Naples they have bonbons round their necks. The priest then gravely takes his book and prays God in behalf of these horses, mules, and little pigs; then he concludes by sprinkling the whole menagerie with holy water—and finally, with the relic (a bone of St. Anthony) gives the blessing to the horses, asses, and pigs, and by the intercession of St. Anthony, God delivers them from all evil, amen! The asses, horses, and pigs, not being intelligent enough to kiss the relic, the priest is

obliged to touch them with it solemnly. This is even beyond Paganism. Holy water among Pagans was for man alone—among Romanists, it is also for beasts.

Now we have another resemblance in the talismans. Among the Greeks and Indians you find the talisman hanging to their necks. So it is with the Romanists—you have good Papists, all provided with amulets, rosaries, scapularies, relics, medals, especially medals of the Virgin. In Paris they have a piece of consecrated paper, supposed to preserve from drowning, lightning, sudden death, &c. There are amulets against moral as well as spiritual evils.

The Romanists have no confidence in the occult existence of Christ, but put their faith in exterior objects—so that Roman and Pagan are on an equality here.

I noticed that in England all Puseyite ladies wore crosses on their breasts; so that now I am going to attack the Protestants on this score, but Puseyites, in a short time, become Romanists; Puseyism being the intermediate state to spare or lighten the shame of apostasy. The cross, a Romish symbol, is also a Puseyite symbol. I see it worn in the streets of New York, and I see by this that the enemy is entering into America. Popery, is entering here by seducing the eyes of the ladies. You may say it is only a fashion; but I say, when you are familiarized with the cross, some other superstition may creep in; and so a Puseyite feeling and Romanism will become spread abroad. When I was in Baltimore, I saw a cross on the spire of a Protestant church; so there is on a Catholic church. Where is the difference? In one of the Churches, I also saw an image, and I asked, "Is it a Romish church?" "No—it is a Protestant chapel. This is a Puseyite chapel. The officiating pastor of this chapel was recently converted to Romanism." Then I understood all.

I entered a Protestant chapel—I will not say whether in New York or Baltimore—and I found twelve statues of the Apostles. What did they do there? They were certainly very badly done, if they were there for your edification. If you go into a Roman Catholic chapel, you will find apostles in stone. Remember,

New York men, what happened some time ago. There was a Protestant chapel with all these emblems—and now it is a Catholic chapel.

I shall speak again on this subject, because I am in New York, not for myself, not from any feeling of anger, but because I am here to enlighten and to show Protestants their danger. Remember the words of one who knows the Romish system. Let the Jews have their Talmud, the Orientals their crescents, the Chinese their pagodas. Let the Popish Church have its crosses—but let Protestant chapels have nothing—nothing, because they have Christ, and the pure worship of Christ.

LECTURE II.

THE JESUITS.

My subject this evening is the Jesuits.

I. WE WILL CONSIDER THE JESUITS WITH REGARD TO THEMSELVES.

II. IN REGARD TO THE CHURCH.

III. IN REGARD TO SOCIETY.

Remember that next week I shall give two free lectures at the Tabernacle, to the Industrial classes, and especially to Irishmen; because I have been invited by the Roman Catholic portion of them to do so; and I expect that no people out of these classes will come, in order to leave room for these people who cannot pay.

Some people entertain doubts of my intentions, and say, "You speak against Irishmen." This is a great mistake; and is an unusually Jesuitical misrepresentation, because I have always spoken with respect of Irishmen, not only in America, but also in England; and what I say in a lecture is true, and what all people, Englishmen and all, confess to be true. Scotchmen and Welchmen in the United Kingdom agree that the Irish, for poetry, eloquence, and ability, are unequalled. What a character for a people in the state they are! And they are so, because they are entirely under the dominion of the Romish priesthood. Now, I have nothing to say against Irishmen; and if I have something to say against any one, it shall be against the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland.

Next Monday week, I shall speak on the blindness of the Popish System; and especially, I shall answer Cardinal Wiseman, in his last statement upon my Italy. Next Thursday, at the Tabernacle, all the proceeds will be devoted to Italian exiles who are expected here from Piedmont; they are well provided for by the Piedmontese government.

I see by one of the newspapers that all charitable people are invited to concur in this charitable work. I therefore shall give a good example, and will devote the proceeds in behalf of these young and deluded persons.

I beg to inform my audience, that by this donation I do not intend any slight to the Piedmontese government, which I respect so much. I merely wish to aid those whom the Piedmontese are unwillingly obliged to expel.

Now I come to consider the Jesuits in regard to themselves.

The Jesuit is a member of the Society of Jesus; many of my auditors will tell me that they know some Jesuits who are gentle, kind, and good; that is true. I know many individuals among Jesuits who are very good people, their only sin is that they are Jesuits; but, except that, they are good, charitable, pious, gentle, and loving.

This is not the question. We speak not of individuals but of Jesuits, the Society of Jesuits.

Let me give you a comparison. Suppose a very large and elegant pic-nic party, where each one brings a particular dish or a particular wine, and as usual in these parties, all the best fish, fowls, beef, venison, plum-pudding, pie, and all kinds of things, together with wine and champagne, all excellent. But suppose the leader of the party, by a mere caprice, should take all these good things, and put them all together in a cauldron, and then should stir it together, and then serve up the mess to the party, how would that be? Why, each individual article was good alone—all and each were very good—but all together, bad. So are the Jesuits. Some are fish and some fowl, and good at that; but all together, bad, very bad. Therefore, in speaking of this subject, we speak not against Father Peter or Father Paul, but against Father Jesuit, because Fathers Peter and Paul

may be good, but as Jesuits they cannot be good. Never good always, and everywhere bad, because they are Jesuits.

Now they are bad in regard to themselves; but some say they are moral. No religious body in the Popish system is so severe in their habits and practices as are the Jesuits; that is true, very true. I have nothing to say against the morality of the Jesuits. The Pharisees also appeared very good in their exterior, they appeared as clean sepulchres, but inside they are filled with bones of corpses. So with the Jesuits—their exterior very good, very holy; but beneath this exterior, they are full of all kind of immoralities and abominations, from the beginning till to-day. This Society of Jesus has ever been in the first degree of immorality, and so considered among all enlightened people. In the beginning, when they were allowed to extend and multiply themselves, the living correspondence of fathers and rectors was discussed, and they were expelled; and, now, in our last crusade in Italy, the Italian volunteers entered Modena and despoiled the College of the Jesuits, where they discovered and preserved a large epistolary correspondence between the holy fathers and their secret lovers of the confessional and of the nunnery. This is the morality of the Society of Jesus! And these are the enemies of morality most dangerous, because people believe in this external appearance of holiness, and are deceived by their apparent morality. But the most dangerous doctrine inculcated by the Jesuits is that of passive obedience. All historians and panegyrists of this society extol the *obedience* of the Jesuits, as the best kind of obedience. Never! A man is a good Jesuit, only when he is no more a man. So long as he remains a man, he cannot be a good Jesuit; but when he becomes a stone, then he is a very good and perfect Jesuit. This is a great merit, people say—a great virtue. Before God, certainly, obedience is a virtue; but before blind and stupid man, no! Because God created man to be a man, and not a stone; and, therefore, to become a stone, is not a virtue before God. The first gift of God is liberty; and to voluntarily give up liberty, is to despise the word of God. God created man a reasonable being, to use his reason to promote his own salvation, and in behalf of his

brethren. Now, if a man renounce his own reason, he renounces the gift and word of God, and therefore does not please God, but becomes a brute. You guide your horses where you will, because they are horses—because they are beasts; and when the Father Superior, and the Father Provincial General of the Jesuits guides this large body as he pleases, it is because this body of men are no more men but machines, and therefore are unable to please God. The virtue of obedience among the Jesuits is most fatal to mankind and society at large.

What do you call your regular army? You call it brute force. Why? Because its soldiers obey implicitly their generals and superiors, and thus destroy freedom and happiness of the people and nations, for at their bidding the freedom and happiness is destroyed. This is by brute force.

The Jesuits resemble an army inasmuch as they hang together, and are formed into companies. It is an army without will, without reason, without freedom of discussion, whose only rule is implicit obedience, and unresisting submission to brute force. Therefore, as brute force is always fatal to civilized society, fatal to the true freedom of nations; so the moral brute force of the Jesuits is fatal to religious freedom, to the freedom of the Gospel. These Jesuits have, they pretend to say, for motive of action, the glory of God, "*ad Dominum di gloria.*" Christ, too, promoted the glory of God; but the Jesuits go further; they are more enlightened than Christ himself—they not only promote the glory of God, but the very highest glory of God. They go further than Christ himself. Christ preached charity, honesty, justice, and rational religion, in order to glorify God. The Jesuits preach mental reservation, perjury, lies, immoralities, regicide, to subvert society, in order to obey the vicar on earth. This is for the greatest glory of God. We are satisfied to honor Christ after the manner of Christ, and to give him glory in all our acts, but when you go farther than that, it must be you are no more in the just or right way, because we have an ancient proverb to the effect that all extremes are dangerous, and when you do not content yourself with the glory of God, as Christ

gives it you, you will perhaps prefer the greater glory of the Jesuits.

Whenever you are in extremes you are in danger of immorality; now this is the case with the Jesuits. They say they have fought for the Church, in support of the Church of Christ, but Oretin, Joli, Grasse, and other father Jesuits have repeated this little blasphemy, that the Church of Christ cannot subsist without the Jesuits. If you go to the confessional of the Jesuits, if you read the recent books written by Jesuits, if you go to hear the preaching of the Jesuits, you will frequently hear repeated, "The church cannot exist without the Jesuits." Did the primitive church of Christ exist by means of the Jesuits? No; not the true church of Christ; therefore, the true church of Christ *can* subsist without the Jesuits. But it is said, the times have changed, and men also have changed, and what was not necessary in the beginning of the Church is necessary now. When did the Jesuits arise? The Jesuits arose when papacy and the Pope were attacked by Luther and Calvin, and the reformers of that day, and as this church was trembling under these attacks, there arose the support of the Jesuits.

But the church which was trembling under the attacks of Cranmer, Luther, Melancthon, was not the church of Christ. It was the church of Rome. Therefore, the Jesuits were instituted to support the Pope. And this is true. The Church of Rome cannot subsist without Jesuits, and if you destroy the Jesuits, you destroy the Church of Rome.

Was it Christ who inspired Ignatius Loyola to establish his Society of Jesus? No! Because Christ did not recognise the necessity of such an institution in his true primitive church. But if the Church of Rome is apostate from the Gospel, if the church of the anti-christ is the daughter of Satan, then Satan is the patron of the Jesuits.

What good have the Jesuits done in behalf of the Church? They have corrupted it, they have corrupted its worship, its morals, and its faith; they corrupted its worship after their incorporation into the papal system, and introduced all kinds of superstition.

We have the most idolatrous worship from the Jesuits; such as the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the Sacred Heart of the Virgin Mary, and what are called the Three Hearts of our Divine Saviour on Gol Gotha; the Blessed Sacrament, the Transubstantiated or Consecrated water; so that no superstition, no idolatrous worship, was for three centuries in the Church which was not originated by the Jesuits.

They follow many of the practices inculcated in the books of Alfonso, the most fanatical and corrupt ever written. To read some of their books you would believe them to be the most licentious people in the world.

Protestants are apt to think the Jesuits moral. According to their morality you may say yes or no, not according to the truth, but merely to your own personal advantage. They teach, that it is necessary to practise mental reservation. Suppose you were accused of going to murder a man, (I am going to illustrate mental reservation) "No, I am not going to commit murder"—because you were being taken in a carriage, or made use of some conveyance to get at this man you were going to murder. We have in Latin double meanings to words—*Volo*, is a word which in Latin has two meanings, *volo*, *velle*, is to wish, *volo*, *volare*, is to fly; I can say, I wish you to-day, Friday, to eat a chicken—you can answer, no, I volo non. But you may understand yourself to say, I do not fly. All anagrams are also instances of this double meaning. You can swear upon the Gospel, you have not committed this sin, when you did commit it under a mental reservation; and you may swear that you were not perjured when you swore that you did not commit it. It is really true that your words may give a wrong conviction, yet by your mental meaning, you are not forced to reveal, you are excused from perjury. This is a very elastic morality, this morality of mental reservation, when you are pressed to confess the truth and can only escape by means of mental reservation; yet this is the morality of the Jesuits.

According to this morality, you, though a Romanist, here among Protestants can pretend to be a Protestant; you must be a Jesuit, though in other respects, you have to look and act like

a Protestant. You can with holiness and purity say and do as the Protestants do; go to Protestant schools and read Protestant books, without lying or imposition. You do not deceive any one, for it is for the greatest glory of God and promotes proselytism.

The last degree in the morality of Jesuitism is Father Molina's doctrine of quietism, which aids all kind of sin. The immoral tendencies of these teachings are permitted as necessary. The mind must be quiet and in repose with God; if your mind and soul are fixed on God, and at the same time you rob your brother, you kill your father, or your wife, you have not committed robbery nor murder (*ad Domini gloriam*). Quietism is merely putting this motto in practice. This is quietism. The Council of Paris condemned this doctrine of Molina as fatal to society, because he carried the doctrine to the extent of killing kings. It is said that many kings who opposed this theory became its victims; but the Jesuits even declared that in everything the end sanctifies the means. All things are permitted as means of attaining a good end. St. Paul said that is not permitted, however good the object; but the Jesuits say the contrary—do anything for a good end—commit any crime if you can effect a little good; as all good, in the opinion of the Jesuits, consists in promoting the Jesuitical cause—even if, for the good of that cause, it is necessary to subvert, to oppress, to kill all Europe, and then to carry on a war in order to promote the advantage of the Jesuits. This is their code of morality. But the Jesuits are the greatest enemies against the purity of the gospel, and therefore against the true faith of Christ.

I have said that the Jesuits were instituted to oppose the triumph of Luther and the other Reformers in the sixteenth century. All the Jesuit has to do is to make war, to engage parties against Protestantism, called in their language a bad heresy, and the Jesuits have been faithful to their object. From the beginning they always opposed what they called heretics and heresy. This, then, is the point: what is heresy with the Jesuits is Christianity in the opinion of Christ; and, therefore, when Jesuits oppose Protestants as heretics, they oppose the primitive Chris-

tianity of Jesus. This is the aim of the Jesuits; and in order to attain such an end, they have no distinctive costume, no special abode, no special worship; they change according to circumstances, so that you have Jesuits as Jesuits, Jesuits as Ligonists, Jesuits as Passionists, Jesuits as Capuchins. So you have Jesuits among the priests, you have Jesuits among the laity, Jesuits often in short dress, often in military dress. At one time in the dress of a magistrate, at one time in the dress of a policeman, and so on. Every day and everywhere you have Jesuits. Father Personio, the first Jesuit who went to England, went in the dress of a Spanish officer, and was received as such at the Court of Elizabeth, so that he was enabled to arrange the gunpowder plot. Father Garnet, another Jesuit who was at the head of the gunpowder plot, had five different names, as appeared on his trial. Now recognise, if you can, the Jesuits among Americans. You think sometimes that you recognise the true character of the Italian, French, and Polish refugee, because he declaims against tyrants and tyranny, and against the Pope, and wears a large moustache. Yet often, my dear brethren, he is a Jesuit.

Do you see one small, little, insignificant, poor fellow coming in? You are welcome. He is not higher than Tom Thumb. You remember Tom Thumb, with large boots; so this little fellow is more a postillion than a courier. Two great spurs in the boots, spectacles to the eyes, he looks as a Spaniard, but he speaks French. Come in, you are welcome among us. I have the honor to introduce to you, my audience, little Tom Thumb, called in New York the *Courier of the United States* newspaper, printed in the French language, and pretending to be the organ of the French population.* Oh! my dear boy! my poor boy! you are the *Courier of the United States*, and you dare to say that I am wrong when I speak so loudly and so warmly against France. My naughty boy, I am not the *Courier of the United States* who

* We have retained the peculiar idiom of the Father in this circumstance, though nothing can give an idea of the intense humor and irony of his manner and imitations, which convulsed the audience. The Father speaks of Mr. M——, the Editor of the "*Courrier des Etats Unis*."

was going to Paris in order to solicit the Cross of the Legion of Honor and the pension from the bastard Bonaparte. My naughty boy, I spoke warmly and passionately against France, because when a man has witnessed two thousand brethren wounded and killed by a French army, this man cannot have any sympathy for the French liberticide nation. I spoke against France, but not against the liberal France, not against patriotic France, the minority of the French population. I spoke against the France which sold our liberty for a glass of champagne. You call yourself the organ of the French population. Oh! poor Spaniard, you are not the organ of the French population. Read, my little boy, read! this—this is a true Frenchman—this is the great Quinet, the greatest professor in our age—Professor of History. This is Quinet—expelled from France by the Jesuits. His work on the Revolution in Italy, is dedicated “To the exiled Italians, as a personal expiation for the murder of Italy, consummated by Frenchmen.” This is a Frenchman, who has spoken in this manner—this is a *true* Frenchman—and in Italy we honor such a Frenchman—and we honor the France which produced such a Frenchman. But remember, my boy, that we have no anger against you; but I shall give you some advice: Don’t announce yourself, henceforth, as the “organ of the French population,” but ask to be received as the organ of Archbishop Hughes! And don’t call yourself any more the “Courier of the United States,” but call yourself the Courier of the Jesuits throughout the United States. This Courier is an instrument in the hands of the Jesuits, and maintained for the purpose of spreading their doctrines and theories.

But there is a more dangerous weapon, still, of Jesuitism—for you, especially. And remember my words concerning it. The missions among Protestants are especially conducted by Jesuit females: because, where Jesuit men could obtain no hearing among Protestants, they endeavor to proselyte by means of women. Whatever might have been the case ten years ago, there are now in this country thousands and thousands of nuns, engaged in the work of proselytism among the Protestants. They are composed of all classes of women, and operate under

all sorts of names. They are "Ladies of the Sacred Heart," "Sisters of Mercy," "Sisters of Charity,"—but they are all Jesuit females, my dear brethren! Many dangers and many perils await you from such missionaries. Remember—I don't know whether I touched on this point or not in a former lecture. In order to tempt Adam, the serpent made use of Eve, because the serpent, called in the Word of God the most subtle of all the beasts of the field, knew that with Adam he would have lost his time. He knew Adam to be too strong to be tempted by a beast. But this painted, beautiful serpent was pleasing to Eve. Eve fell; and with great grace and fine manners, Eve tempted Adam—and Adam, as all men are apt to be beset with their wives,—poor Adam!—ate the apple to please his wife—poor Adam! who never would have yielded to the temptation of the serpent!

Now for the application.

The male Jesuits, perhaps, would lose their time in preaching to Protestant people, to induce them to become Romanists. But when all these kind sisters come from Europe—such beautiful nuns—so elegantly dressed—so modest—speaking the French language so correctly—some of our Protestant ladies, very kind, very pious ladies, having great pretension to intelligence, drink in the words from the mouths of these nuns, and their doctrines pass into the hearts of these Americans. In time, they are transfused into the hearts of their husbands and children. This is the manner of proselytism with the nuns. And in England, especially among the great families, many become Romanists through the persuasions of these Sisters of Mercy. Remember my words—and remember, also, that in order to teach young girls in the capacity of governesses—to tend the sick in hospitals—we do not need any kind of nuns: because Protestant wives, mothers and daughters, suffice to instruct Protestant girls, and to assist in hospitals.

But if this aim of the Jesuits is fatal to the true church, it is not fatal to Popery, my dear brethren. And this brings me to the second part of my subject—namely: that the Jesuits are not in support of the true Church of Christ. On the contrary; they

are against the true church ; and, till we have no Jesuits, we shall never have the preaching for the spread of the true doctrine of Christ. The Jesuits are the support of Popery. They are called, by Frederick the Great, "the grenadiers of the Pope." Voltaire called them the "pioneers of the Pope." Another has called them the "Mamelukes of the Pope," because they are the especial body-guard who surround the Pope. You see, then, that they are a beautiful society ! The Pope cannot exist without the Jesuits, and the Jesuits cannot exist without the Pope. They mutually help each other. If you destroy the Jesuits, it will then be easy to destroy Popes and Popery. If you destroy Popes and Popery, Jesuitism will then be destroyed. This, then, is the conclusion of the matter : the hardy columns of the Jesuits and the Popes, are the foundations of the Temple of Baal. We invoke from heaven a Samson to embrace both these columns, Pope and Jesuit, and to give a good strong pull to them.

Now, for the influence of the Jesuits in a social point of view. They are certainly fatal to society—to small as well as large communities, to society private as well as social. Private society we may consider as made up of mind, heart, and pocket. And against mind, heart, and pocket, the Jesuits are continually at work. As to mind, they monopolize especially the education of the young. But their schools and their education are very bad. No one who knows the vocation of the Jesuits in Italy, Spain, and France, as teachers, can deny this proposition. An instance or two, will suffice for the satisfaction of the American people. In my Italy, the Jesuits were always the greatest enemies of the great Dante ; and, as Dante is the Shakspeare of the Italians, without our Shakspeare, we have not the true blood of the Italian nation. In order to suck the blood from the Italian nation, the Jesuits expelled from their schools the reading of Dante. In our last great reaction against republicanism, their first work was to expel from their schools all Greek and Latin classics. No Muse, no Cicero, no Tacitus, no Virgil ! Why ? Because they are too much republicans—too much liberals. This is the reason why the Jesuits in Catholic Rome wish to have schools without the classics ; and instead of them, introduce their stupid Jesuit

authors. Good school, that! Classic people must come from such a school! From Jesuit teachers you can only expect Jesuit scholars. All instruction is excluded from the schools of France, also, in the same manner; and the best proof of it is, that Quinét and Michelet—two of the greatest philosophers of the age—were expelled from the Academy by the influence of the Jesuits, in order to have the chairs of these professors for themselves or for their pliant tools.

Another thing will prove to the American people, the fatal effects of Jesuitism upon society. It is said by a distinguished historian, "that in the first French Revolution, no Jesuit took part in delivering his country from despotism and tyranny." See, then, Americans! what would have been the condition of things in your own case, if, in the time of your great Washington, you had had here the Jesuits, as numerous as at present. Not one of them would have taken arms to defend his native country and free America from foreigners and foreign despotism. Such are the Jesuits, where they have the sole control of affairs among governments.

And now they are trying to establish schools, also, in America—and many Americans patronize them, and advocate the granting of permission to the Jesuits to establish separate public schools, which shall share the public funds devoted to the support of public education. No, no! They came to America, a few years ago, poor and humble, pretending to be missionaries of Christ. And now, since they have found in America a sleeping Protestantism, they increased in their pretensions, and in the boldness of their language, and rapidly extended their influence—so that now they dare to pretend to share the appropriations by the government for Protestant schools and Protestant teachers. But, if you continue on in this course, and remain dependant on the Romanists for teachers, in a few years America will present the same spectacle as now in England; fifty years ago Pitt and others proclaimed the freedom of teaching, and made an endowment from the public treasury to Maynooth. That appropriation increased to £82,000 sterling per annum. What were the results? The teaching of rebellion—

teaching against the laws of the British Parliament—teaching against the obedience due to the Queen of England—teaching rebellion in practice, through these rebellious priests, educated in Maynooth—teaching civil war—riots in Paisley, in Limerick, and especially in Liverpool, at the Six Mile Bridge, and Stockport. This is especially the result of permitting Jesuitism a foot-hold in the national education. Devote a large sum to Jesuit schools, here, and in a few years you, too, will have enough of citizens to disobey the public law, and to trample upon your country and its Protestant faith, and to trample upon all human rights.

But the best argument of all for Americans, to rouse them from their sleep and apathy on this point, is the subject of dollars. It is a very genial subject! I read on board the steamer *Baltic*, when coming to America, a funeral oration preached in Boston, I believe, by Theodore Parker, in which I was struck, for the first time, with the announcement, that the American people were very fond of dollars. I do not despise dollars myself—nor by any means do I despise you for loving them. But the Jesuits—they like dollars, too, my brethren! And if you like a few dollars, the Jesuits like a good many dollars; and they practise many skilful arts to make dollars. They have the art of the confessional—and, above all, they have the art to persuade dying people to make their last will in favor of the Jesuits. And when they don't do such business themselves, they have their emissaries, in all conditions of life, who do it for them. In Milan, a few years ago, we had a Count Milario, who visited the noblemen about to die there, to induce them to leave their property to the Jesuits. In a few years he secured in this way six millions of Italian funds, in support of the Society of the Jesuits. This is what one of their emissaries could do.

The Jesuits work very hard to accomplish their objects. I remember in a jesuitical history, of the beginning of this society, the father rector of a college in the Low Countries, granted a passport to a man called Jacob, to defend and protect him from all attacks and evils in life, and be a passport to happiness after he was dead. He gave a hundred and forty thousand dollars for a passport! And a hundred and forty thousand dollars

is a little money, my dear brethren! And with this passport he went everywhere without fear, because the Jesuits had guaranteed its power. This is the way the society happens to be so very rich.

One more instance of their craft. In my country they have long had a very large, unfinished church—and in order to finish the façade of this church, they persuaded a marquis to leave in his will a sum of money in this way: "this sum shall be left to the Jesuits, until they have finished the façade." Three or four years were enough to finish the façade. How long, then, do you think the Jesuits enjoyed the income of the marquis? A hundred and twenty-five years, my dear brethren! And when the Jesuits were suppressed, in the last century, the façade remained just as it was; and even to this day is not finished. But, mark you! this is only an example of their "mental reservation." At the final judgment this façade will not have been completed!

Another example. Some eighteen years ago a man died in Naples, who had no sons, but who had a brother—a poor, honest man, and very celebrated for his learning and liberal principles, and with five or six children. In dying, the rich man left, in his last will, eighty thousand dollars to the Jesuits, and said, "I leave this money to the Jesuits, because they are so powerful, that they will never cede this money to my brother, whom I wish never to have it." And, in dying, he had continually near him a Jesuit father, as a confessor. In his last will, he said, "I leave my especial malediction to my brother, and to the children of my brother." This is the morality of the Jesuits! And if you would not be robbed, watch the Jesuits! When the Jesuits, either openly or in disguise, enter among your families or your kindred, watch and prevent robbery there, and prevent the moral assassination of your sons and daughters!

But from domestic life, let us pass to a broad view of general society. You will find Jesuitism fatal, everywhere. If kings are Jesuits, Jesuits are subservient to kings and rulers. If kings and rulers despise Jesuits, they menace them, conspire against them. Do not mistake. Remember that we have a true history

of Europe. I have spoken before of Father Molina, and his doctrine of killing kings. King John, of Portugal, was wounded by order of the Jesuits. The reverend father was in this plot. In the gunpowder plot we find three Jesuits—at the head of the plot was Father Garnet. The Jesuits are essentially absolutists. They are substantially a monarchy; by their education, they prefer monarchical to constitutional and republican rule. And this is the reason why I fear the Jesuits in your America. When I look on the continent of the Old World, I find the Jesuits are favorites in Austria, in Tuscany, in Lombardy, and in the Roman States. Wherever you have despots, you have Jesuits, under their favor and protection; and wherever you have liberal governments, you have Jesuits who menace them. I have spoken of the Jesuits in Belgium, in Piedmont, and in England. They are also in Prussia, which is the most liberal government for the Romanists, in all Europe. But for all that, the King of Prussia was obliged at last to expel the Jesuits, in order to obtain quiet in his kingdom, and to prevent discord.

I have now something to say about you. I was in Italy in the *Propaganda Fide*, not more than twelve or thirteen years ago. I knew at the time that the Jesuits were coming to America to proselytize its people. They used frequently to say, in our private meeting, "We lose much ground in Europe, especially in Italy. Italy decreases in attachment to us, day by day. It is necessary, therefore, to regain this ground. We go to America to restore the loss sustained by Popery in Europe." This was the reason why they came to America. But, my dear Americans! Remember the Jesuits, and Jesuitism! Remember that you will find Jesuits and despotism always united. But you cannot find a liberal people friends with the Jesuits. The first and most important thing I have to say—and I say it with great sincerity and earnestness—is what we said in Italy, in 1847, when we received the first gift of a liberal Constitution: "Out with the Jesuits from Italy!" And the Jesuits were everywhere expelled from Italy—from Naples, from Piedmont, from Lombardy, from the Roman States, from everywhere. And they don't come back again! I suspect that many of these Jesuits

have come to America, as many of them have gone to England. Many people in New York say they don't know anything about that—we do not care, and we will not interfere. My suspicion is now certain, because when I was in Baltimore, the first thing I heard from my Italian friends, was, that there were many Jesuits in Baltimore, and in Pennsylvania many dozen Jesuits, who were expelled from Italy—all speaking the Italian and French languages well. Therefore, what they said about making up their losses in Europe, here, is true. And so you now have many hundred Jesuits working among you. Oh, too good Americans! Much too good Americans! You believe they are working in behalf of American principles—in the interest of the American nation—to help to increase the American glory. Oh, poor, blind American people! The Jesuits only work for themselves. They work for Rome alone. They work to increase the power of the Pope in America. No, no! Believe what you will—conclude practically from such preaching. If I were in my native country—as, by the blessing of God, I hope to be before the end of this year—I should say to my countrymen, “To morrow, in this land, no more Jesuits!” And to-morrow, in this land, would be no more Jesuits—no more king—no murderer. “I have never preached assassination and murder. But, go out! We will pay your expenses.” This is what I should say in my native country. In England there is a law in existence against the Jesuits. I plainly said to the English people, “Europe calls you a serious and logical nation; but in my opinion, you are a very illogical people. You have a law against Jesuits. This law is in ‘the Act of Emancipation’—and under this law, instead of being fourteen Jesuits in England, as before the law, there are now five hundred in spite of the law. My dear Englishmen, I do not preach persecution—but I preach legality and equal justice—which, if you practise, you will be called a legal and consistent people.”

But I can preach you something, in America, too. Before the formation of your Constitution, they were not free to work against your laws and republican institutions. Now, they are free. If, then, the Jesuits are here, to work against your laws,

and Constitution, and freedom, watch them! Practise no murder, no persecution, upon them, but watch their movements; and in the first instance that you detect the Jesuits really teaching anti-republican principles,—really teaching doctrines contrary to American freedom—if you find the Jesuits actually working practically against your Constitution, and against your freedom, after a clear proof of it, take the first opportunity, my dear Americans, to expel the Jesuits from your country; and you will be always certain to be free.

Ho, ho, ho! But this is what is called preaching discord! These are what are called “fatal lectures”—the lectures of Father Gavazzi—thus, this is what is called doing more evil than good! We were so peaceable before his arrival! We lived together on such friendly terms! This man has come to create discord among us! But I come only to preach against Jesuits and Jesuitism. In England, people said, “You will find in America, strong independence: you will find in America, a people very fond of self-independence.” And I find in America many and many Protestants without independence at all, but verily and truly, dependence upon Romanists. You have in your country some politicians who preach peace, and tolerance—leave all free. Why? Why, they expect the votes of the Romanists. This is, really, “strong, self-independence!” And I find in America some—fortunately, not the majority—some public writers, some belonging to the public press, some editors and proprietors of newspapers, who speak always with great reverence of the Romanists, and keep silence upon the glories of Protestantism. They speak about all Papist operations and movements—not a corner-stone is laid, no sermon is preached by the Right Reverend So-and-so, but it is duly and respectfully chronicled. Ho, ho, ho, ho! Great “independence!” They fear to lose four or five cents. But, my dear brethren, why are politicians, and writers, and some newspapers, so subservient to the Popish system? I do not speak so particularly about politicians—because they have no faith or religion at all. Christian, Jew, Turk, or Gentile, is the religion of a politician; his only thought is for a place worth five, ten, twenty thousand dollars—

for an ambassadorship to London, Paris, or somewhere else. I cannot speak much, then, about the politicians. But what is the reason these people are so fond of the Romanists? It is a good lesson to the Protestants,—politicians, newspaper-writers, and all,—to learn that Romanists everywhere are united. Therefore politicians and editors say, with great unanimity, "If I can pay my court to the Archbishop of New York, who can dispose of thirty or forty thousand votes, as all the Romish Catholic voters are united in Archbishop Hughes—I shall get these votes from Archbishop Hughes." So, they are subservient and truckling to Archbishop Hughes.

This, then, is the important point: To note the union among Romanists, which makes their influence. The influence of Romanists depends, in a capital point of view, on their Union. Unite together, then, you Protestants! and you will have the majority in your country. I was ashamed, in Baltimore, to find fifty thousand Romanists opposing and almost conquering a hundred and fifty thousand Protestants. Take the advice of an Italian exile; you will do honor to your nation if you hear to me. No! Protestants! Remember always, I do not preach persecution of the Romanists; but I cannot permit, in a Protestant country, in which Protestantism makes the freedom and glory of the people,—I cannot permit the people to be sacrificed to the Romanists. Americans, remember the last words of this evening. Your very glorious and very dear American Washington did not fight against England in order to prepare the present generation to kneel at the feet of the Bishop of New York, or of any bishop in the universe. No! Washington fought to prepare the Americans to be free, and to be a Protestant people.

LECTURE III.

WHAT IS THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE ROMISH SYSTEM?

THE subject of my lecture this evening is, What is the Individual in the Romish System? In reference to this question, I shall prove three things: viz., The Individual in the Romish System is a blind, a superstitious, a poor man—poor in the sense of poverty. He is a blind man, because blindness is produced by the teaching of the Romish clergy. He is a superstitious man, by the authority and under the influence of the Romish clergy. He is a poor man, because the authority of the Church produces misery.

The Individual in the Popish System is a blind man, because blindness is produced by the teaching of the Roman Catholic clergy. Is it not sufficient to say, that in the Popish system the Individual is prohibited from reading the Bible? Can the Papists deny that many and many among the ancient Popes, and all the modern Popes, absolutely prohibited the reading of the Bible, especially in any vernacular tongue? It is true that, in Protestant countries, the Romish clergy, in order to avoid the imputation that the Church of Rome prohibits the reading of the Bible, allows a few Catholic booksellers to have the Douay Bible in their shops. But that is not the question this evening. My question is, whether, in the Popish service, the Bible is read every Sunday before the people, in the English language, in America, or in the French language among the French, or in the German language among the Germans? Not at all, my dear

brethren. In the Sunday service, you have mass—sometimes sermon—but never Bible. This is not all. Your curate, your parish priest, your father confessor—does he recommend you to read the Bible in private? does he recommend the reading of the Bible in your families? If he does, he insists on your obtaining it from the Romish bookseller. Does he recommend your reading it every evening before going to sleep? Does he recommend the Romish Catholic families to read a chapter from the Bible in the morning when they rise up? No, no! Neither in public nor private, neither in pulpit nor confessional, never does the Popish clergy recommend the reading of the Bible. And there is a very good reason for that, my dear brethren. Because, if the Bible were read freely by all Roman Catholics, in a few years Popery would disappear from the earth. Therefore, you will never find a Roman Catholic priest guilty of such a suicidal policy. Read the Bible! Read the Bible! and, good-bye to Pope and Popery! In order to maintain Pope and Popery, with all due respectability—to preserve it from all attacks, and from final destruction—the Roman Catholic clergy, very prudently and very properly, forbid the reading of the Bible. Now, in a few words, my dear brethren, are you enlightened without the Bible, or are you blind? Were you even the best philosopher in the world—were you the most scientific man—the most learned among all learned people—without the Bible you would be nothing, because, without the Bible, there is no light for mankind. This is not a *Protestant* opinion merely, I beg to remind you. No—this is the opinion of David, in his Psalm, where he says that the Word of God is a light to our feet in our earthly pilgrimage. And that is not his judgment alone—it is also St. Peter's maxim. St. Peter said, the Word of God is the lamp which enlightens the hosts in darkness in this dark world. Therefore the Word of God alone is our light. If the people are without the Word of God, they will be without light. But the Roman Catholic people are without the Word of God—therefore, the Roman Catholic people are without light. My Roman Catholic friend, what can you say of your religion? Nothing—nothing! Why do you believe? What do you believe? You

say you believe the Church. Why do you believe the Church? Because the Church believes. But what does the Church believe? What I believe. Why does the Church believe? Because I believe! Well—in a word, answer me: *What do you and the Popish Church together believe?* Why,—we believe together! This is the answer, my dear brethren! Because, among the Roman Catholics, blindness is a duty and an obligation. Without this blindness nobody can be a good, reliable Roman Catholic. Therefore, it is necessary to renounce reason to be a good Roman Catholic. Become a tree—become a stone—become an unreasoning beast—and you are a good Roman Catholic.

But this is not the doctrine of St. Paul. He said, give a reason for the faith that is within you. Therefore, there is no faith, no religion, where there is no discussion.

In order to have a faith based on reason,—in order to embrace freely and willingly, as a human being, a religion—it is necessary, beforehand, to be persuaded of the truth of this religion. It is necessary to discuss and examine a faith, a religion; so that, after embracing it, you can give a satisfactory reason for your faith. If you embrace the Roman Catholic religion, because your father and mother were Roman Catholics, you are no rational believer—you are an unreasoning Catholic; an unreasoning animal. Therefore, I maintain that, without free examination, without free discussion upon the Bible, nobody can be enlightened in this spiritual work. This, also, is the declaration of the Word of God itself.

Many among the Roman Catholics meet one on this point with the text quoted from the Gospel, to the effect that, "Who-soever does not obey you, does not obey me; and whosoever obeys you, obeys me." Before these words, Christ said, "As my heavenly Father sent me, I send you. If they will not obey you, they will not obey me." The apostles did not come in the same way as your Roman Catholic priests. They came, not excluding the word of God, and all discussion on it; but they came to offer a free choice to all to accept their preaching, or not. In other words, Christ came into this world, not to destroy the

law, but to confirm it. Christ came into this world, and preached to mankind—not saying, “go, obey blindly the priests—go, search the bulls of the Popes; the apostolic traditions—the pastorals of bishop and archbishop—the sermons of the parish priest.” No! Christ came into this world, and said, “Search the Scriptures.” These are the words of the Bible. Therefore, when Christ says, “If any one does not obey you, he does not obey me,” that does not exclude the searching of the Scriptures—it includes it. And, after having searched the Scriptures, and comparing the words of the priest with the Word of God, and finding that they both correspond—then, if the people do not obey the priest, they do not obey God. St. John says in his first epistle, “Do not believe any spirit, but try all spirits.” St. Paul said to the Galatians, “Examine my doctrines—and if they agree with the Word of God, embrace them. If they do not agree, I authorize you to anathematize my words.” St. Paul says to the Thessalonians, “Try all things, and hold to that which is good.” The apostle says further, in the seventeenth chapter, that the brethren were praised before God for not obeying blindly the preaching of the apostle Paul, but regulating their belief in it by the inspired Word of God. Therefore, the conclusion is, that you cannot be good Christians while you obey blindly your priests. If you would be good Christians, try your priests, examine them, and compare their teachings with the Word of God. But this is very far from the practice of the people of the Church of Rome. She fears comparison with the Word of God; and with good reason—because, under the control of the Word of God, there can be no novelty introduced into the Church. But, because by introducing novelty into the Church, the Roman Catholic clergy gain two things, influence and money—they, therefore, evade the Word of God.

One more observation. I will ask the Roman Catholic cause to deny, if it can, that the Roman Catholic Church does not forbid the reading of the Bible? It is as clear as the sun at mid-day—in fact, it cannot be denied—because many, indeed the majority of all the Popes have gone against the Word of God.

Now, why this hatred against the word of God? Please to answer me calmly, oh, Roman Catholics. If the Roman Catholic be the true Church, if it were really the primitive church of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church need not fear the reading and authority of the Word of God, because then it would, of course, agree with the Bible. If the Church of Rome opposes the reading of the Bible, it is a proof that the Church dreads the authority of the Bible, and, therefore, I must conclude that it is no more the Church of Christ. The Church of Rome does, then, fear the Word of Christ, and this is the reason why the Church of Rome has always forbidden the reading of the Word of God; and thus it has so well succeeded in introducing her peculiar dogmas and tenets. When you exclude the Word of God, you reject the highest rule of faith—of discipline, of morals—but finding it necessary to introduce something about the Scriptures, instead of the Holy Bible, the Church of Rome invented the Apostolical Traditions, the Papal Bulls, the Canons of the Councils, the Sentences of the Holy Fathers, the theories of various divines, and the writings of the ascetics.

My dear brethren, I beg you will meditate upon this maxim, which I would wish engraven on your hearts.

On one side you have the Word of God—you have the commandment of God to read his Word, and thus to obtain eternal salvation, and the Word of God is all-sufficient. On the other hand you have the apostolic traditions—yes, but they are the traditions of men, the canons of the councils—still, from men alone; you have the bulls of the Popes—yes, but from men; you have the writings of the Holy Fathers, but they also are men; you have the sermons of your divines—yes, but they likewise are men; you have the meditations of the ascetics—men, nothing but men. Oh, do not despise or neglect the Word of God for visionary follies, obeying the word of man; and if your priests teach you to prefer the authority of the Church of Rome to that of God; and if your priests forbid you to read the Word of God, and God commands you to read it, oh, Roman Catholics, disobey your priests, disobey your bishops; disobey, above all, your Popes—but obey God, obey Christ.

The main cause of blindness among the Roman Catholics is the prohibition of reading the Bible. This prohibition of discussion—logical people!—is their obedience and their faith!

As a second point, flowing from ecclesiastic authority, this blindness among Roman Catholics arises principally from employing the Latin language in their liturgy. It does not come within the scope of my present lecture to prove what I shall prove at Metropolitan Hall on Tuesday; namely, that some things said at a late consecration here were absurd and false.

I will only say now, my dear Roman Catholic brethren, that you who do not read, who have no knowledge of Latin, who have not in your possession an English translation of the Latin worship, my dear Roman Catholics, do you know anything about your Latin worship? When you pray to the Virgin in Latin, with Ave Maria, what do you know about Ave Maria in Latin? When you say the Lord's prayer, "Our Father," "Pater noster"—what do you know about Pater noster? You say, "Maria, ora pro nobis"—do you know what you say? You know nothing about the words you say or the person you say it to. Your mass in Latin is cold and unsatisfactory—how much of it do you understand? When you come to the church of St. Patrick or the church of St. Xavier, what do the priests translate to you from their mass in Latin. Nothing. (*Great manifestation of approbation and disapprobation. The Father begged his friends to desist applauding, as the time was passing.*)

I know when I was in my country, sometimes I enjoyed myself by going into the Italian churches—Catholic, of course—(there they are all Roman Catholic churches) to hear the people praying in Latin. It is a source of great amusement; no theatre, no exhibition, can present such a comedy, because the people know nothing of Latin, when they are blessing the Sacrament.

The ancient people said to the Apostles, pray in Latin, that we may understand; but now, the Italians do not understand anything about it; therefore, your worship in Latin, is against the word of St. Paul, who forbade praying in an unknown tongue; because, the heart could not be touched by words it did not comprehend. The Roman Catholics leave the church as they

entered it, without profit, without moral or spiritual advantage, with cold hearts, with uninstructed and unlearned minds; and, therefore, one of the main powers of the Church of Rome to maintain blindness is to keep up the Latin worship, so that the people may continue in ignorance; and this is the reason that among Catholics, if you ask them the motives of their worship, the reasons of their faith, among ten thousand you will not find one who can give you a reason, because their worship is in Latin; in an unknown language, and with this unknown language the Roman Catholics maintain their obscure cabalistic teaching.

Now, the last point to prove ignorance and blindness among the Roman Catholics is, that the priests take pains to prevent their getting instructed. In my native country it is not extraordinary that the people live in darkness, and cling to their prejudices, because they live among Roman Catholics; but in Protestant countries, a Roman Catholic can enlighten himself, and by discussion conclude even in favor of Romanism; by discussion, by conviction, by reading newspapers and the Bible, by attending lectures to enlighten their minds; but if after discussion and examination, they become Protestants, then they are right, for they have done so upon mature reflection.

And yet you do nothing of this kind—the Roman Catholic priest forbids all research, all examination. I can speak from my own experience in Italy, when we preached for liberty and freedom, oppressed and enslaved by the priesthood. My penitents were forbidden to come to hear me, or to hear my poor friend, Bassi, who was shot by the Austrians at Bologna.

The priests forbade it, and the timid of conscience dared not disobey. To my surprise, I find the same here in the midst of a Protestant country. When I was in England, many Catholics were forbidden from attending my lectures, and here, too, the Roman Catholic priests are trying to prevent it, by public notices from their pulpits, that their people must not come.

My answer is a simple one. If I am not only an apostate but a devil, a real devil, but without horn or tail, my dear brethren, it is quite right that they should forbid people coming. If I am

speaking lies, give the Roman Catholics leave to come, and then to confirm themselves in their apostolical Popish Church, and all its doctrines, because lies and falsehood cannot destroy the Popish Church, and, therefore, no danger threatens it. If I am only a humbug, there is no danger—a humbug is not dangerous.

But if I speak the truth, and they prevent people coming to hear my lecture, that is a sign that the Roman Catholic priesthood is more astute than people believe, for they forbid them to hear me that they may not hear the truth, for then their power, founded on lies, on error, would be destroyed. (*Hisses and cheers of such continued violence, that the Padre could not proceed.*)

I hope the ladies will not be afraid—some hissing is nothing, let it pass, let us make no trouble by replying; it is disgraceful that three or four people should disturb so large an audience of Irishmen; I am afraid the noise may be, in public opinion, attributed to Irishmen. I appeal to the Irishmen to sustain me, and to be calm, and not join in the riot—I know it has been said that Ireland is a savage country. Now to escape this imputation; do so, at least, now, before an American audience; show them that Irishmen are no longer under the control of the priests.

Irishmen, prove yourselves gentlemen, in America. I appeal now, to the Irishmen to obtain peace, do not let people go away, and say, they were Irishmen who made this disturbance.

Do you think, my dear brethren, that I am to be frightened by hisses? they fail in doing this entirely. (*Great applause.*)

Now, the second point of my lecture is, that the Popish is a miserable system; because, it supports the superstition of the people; and, because, it makes use of that superstition to increase the veneration of the people for the clergy. My dear brethren, this is a fact; there is an ancient saying, that the more a people are uncultivated, the more bigotted they are, and the more their veneration for the clergy increases; and, therefore, the influence of the clergy increases in proportion. The Roman Catholic clergy, after blinding the people, claim for themselves the privileges of divinity, so the Catholic clergy, sup-

ported and maintained in college, encourage superstition in order to be worshipped instead of God.

Where are the Roman Catholic clergy worshipped as God? In Ireland.

In Germany, certainly not. But in Ireland the priest is as a God, aye more than God. I know that in Ireland some say if our priest look sternly, unpaternally, and unfriendly, then we have to fear hell, we are afraid of going to the devil. And if a priest stood before our door, and gave us a blow, we should fear the malediction of heaven. My dear Roman Catholic brethren, fear nothing, and believe me, fear only for your pocket, for in order to redeem you from your fear, the priest will tell you if you will pay for a mass, he will redeem you from hell. But the veneration for this clergy, everywhere, especially in Ireland, is maintained by the firm belief that the clergy is really as God.

In Italy, however, we are less bigotted, we respect our priest through fear of the inquisition—no more. I know in my country a few priests who have, and who deserve, a high reputation, and of whom it is said they are holy men. But they are so very few, that when they recognise his merits, the Italians call him a holy man. We are more sincere, because, when in our country some of the priests do not conduct themselves properly, have not the reputation of great morality, the Italians say openly, this is not a good priest.

In Italy the priests do not try to hide their immorality, but in Scotland and Ireland they strive to hide it. I supposed that here, too, the Roman Catholic clergy would have been prudent and cautious, but I find many live in open scandal, in the face of both Protestants and Catholics. Their flocks believe their priests similar to God; and when these scandals come out against them, the people say no, no, it is untrue, he is a very holy man; and thus, by superstition, the Roman Catholic priesthood live in the constant indulgence of license and immorality, at the same time managing to sustain the reputation of purity and holiness.

But, my dear brethren, what kind of superstition could be made to prevail among the Romanists, if they had freely at hand

the Word of God? then they would know that most of the practices of their priesthood are designed only to make the people miserable slaves. Among these superstitions, permit me to mention one. I promised to expose the principal superstition of Ireland. I refer to the traditions concerning St. Patrick. The Roman Catholic clergy do anything they please with the people. What do you believe concerning your saint? He was, it is true, a great saint; I acknowledge him to have been a great leader, a great Christian patriot, very different from your modern bishops, bishops of Ireland, who are all tyrants and despots with their flocks; but their principal point of attack upon the people is through the people's veneration for St. Patrick. The Irish are the best of the United Kingdom, for hand and heart; for I am acquainted with many Irishmen, Protestants and Roman Catholics, and I can, therefore, say for myself, that I found this people like my own Italian people, warm-hearted and noble-minded. So I say, what a pity they are crushed by the Roman Catholic priesthood, who dare impose upon them such superstition. Now this is said in the Latin breviary of St. Patrick. I read it in order to show you what kind of superstition has been imposed upon Ireland. They say that St. Patrick repeated daily the whole of the psalter, with the canticles, three times each day; worshipped God on his knees three hundred times a day, and each hour signed himself with the cross. The night he divided into three parts. In the first he made three hundred genuflections, in the second, immersed in cold water, with eyes and hand raised to heaven, he repeated aloud fifty psalms, and, finally, slept for a short time on a stone. The breviary goes on to say, that St. Patrick was the founder of the Irish Church—that he consecrated in Ireland three hundred and sixty-seven churches, and more than three hundred bishops—and that he preached every day, and also besides toiled, having his daily bread to get by the work of his hands.

Now, brethren, I have a little calculation to make, and as an American is a man of business, I think he will appreciate it. In order to pray through 150 psalms it is necessary to spend twelve

hours and thirty minutes; for the canticles, one hour and a half; for the hymns, another hour; then three hours and a half for three hundred genuflexions; one hour for signing the cross; private prayer three hours and a half—so that for all this devotion, performed by St. Patrick, we have twenty hours and a half every day. I suppose he slept three hours and a half, making thus twenty-four hours of each day. Now, my dear brethren, where had the saint time to establish 867 churches, and to work for his daily bread, besides consecrating 867 bishops? We know that in ancient times, as now, there were only twenty-four hours in a day. What do you conclude from this? You must conclude that this legend is an imposture; and when the Irishmen pray to St. Patrick, because he prayed 150 psalms every day, they are a superstitious people, blindly believing their priests, and grossly mistaking their St. Patrick. The inference from all this is the same as that indicated by the proverb, "You will know the lion by his mane." Is it not true that in Ireland St. Patrick has two purgatories—the purgatory of water in this world, and the other with fire in the next. It is the grossest imposition ever practised. This purgatory is in Loch Derg, Donegal county. It is the Red Loch. We have pilgrims going to the convent of St. Patrick. The pilgrims ask his blessing of the prior, and then going before the altar of St. Patrick, kneel, pray, and then walk seven times round the chapel; then they go to the penitential beds, in which it is said the Seven Sleepers of ancient times slept. They kneel, and pray, and walk three times round each bed. After that they go to three or four stones in the midst of the lake. At the first stone they kneel, pray, and walk three times around it. At the second stone they repeat this ceremony, as also at the third and fourth. Then they proceed again to the chapel and pray to the Virgin Mary. This is the first penitential work, and it is necessary to repeat it three times every day—at sunrise, noon, and sunset. The prior then takes these men and shuts them up, without light, or food, or water, for twenty-four hours, in a cave. On emerging from this confinement, they are stripped naked, and made to go into the waters

of the lake to wash their bodies, especially their heads, in order to show that they have washed away their sins, and after that they have no fear of purgatory; for it is said by the monks, and especially by the prayer-book, that after performing such a penitence, they will surely escape purgatory in the other world, or, at least, get off with a short penance. So powerful is superstition in Ireland. But if you have money, you need not go through this penance; you can hire a substitute, and send him to wash himself for you, and carry to you the absolution for all your sins. My dear brethren, is not this an absurd superstition—this water-purgatory of St. Patrick? What good can this purgatory achieve? Why, it can wash Irishmen, who sometimes never wash in all their lives. (*Hissing.*)

Now this is the kind of superstition upon which the Roman Catholic clergy obtain the veneration of the people; and it is this veneration which leads to the last portion of my lecture, which will treat of the authority of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland over the poor. What are the Romanists in Ireland? What are the people before the priests? The priest is all. The poor people in Ireland, they are very blind, infatuated people; they work, and toil, and live in misery, in order to maintain in luxury their priesthood. This is the life of the poor people in Ireland, and this the exalted position of the priesthood. But it is said that it is necessary to maintain this power, in order to maintain this class, who know the truth, so as to explain it to the people. My dear brethren, the means employed by the priesthood are two, fear and persecution. They intimidate the men, and by this intimidation they succeed in always standing in the position of God. I speak on this point from experience, because I know all the arts of the Roman Catholic priest, which they practise. In your America, in your New York, you had some time ago a young fellow—the people said of him, he is a talented man. He spoke many times in your city against the despots of Ireland; he spoke mostly to Irishmen, to enlighten them about their superstition and their slavery. Now see what happened to him. The priests calum-

mistaken him and persecuted him, and he was obliged to yield, and he knelt to the priests and asked their pardon, and now he is supported by the priests. This is the way with the priests; if they find a weak heart they calumniate him, and try to crush him; but, thank God, not all are dependent upon the priest, and not all have a soul to sell to the Roman Catholic priest. Thank God, that some Irishmen and some Italians will maintain their independence against the priest, even though they are forbidden to preach the gospel of Christ.

When any one secedes from the Romish Church they persecute their victims unrelentingly, but when some leading Protestant joins the Romish Church, the Protestants mention the fact, and then it is forgotten. This is what I call a Christian system, true Christian charity; calumnies cost nothing to the Roman Catholic priesthood; and in order to support their Papal system, they have lately laid its foundation in lies and calumnies.

I would speak on a matter which happened some months ago, but I perceive that the ladies present are alarmed at the manifestations just now, and I will defer it till Friday, when I beg they will not come. I shall then give it to those I allude to, and if the priests send spies and perturbators in order to prevent the second free lecture they will lose their time.

Now, in conclusion, I shall speak about myself. My dear brethren, I do not fear what they can do, I fear only public opinion and the judgment of God; beyond that I fear nothing; therefore I disclaim some reports that were made of my last sermon; do not mistake my mission, I am not here to please any one, but only for God, the Truth, and the Gospel. Do not believe, then, that I am here to preach an American gospel, and then that I will go to Italy and preach an Italian gospel, different from the one I preach here. I am not responsible for reports of my speeches, because I speak very bad English, and I often fail in conveying my meaning. I am sorry for it, and I pity the reporters. If, therefore, any one condemns my mission from the reports he reads in the newspapers, he will commit a great error. When my lectures shall be published by my authority, then I shall stand by what I say.

People attack me because I have spoken against temperance, and against woman's rights, and I am accused of saying to my countrymen, "Don't go and join temperance or woman's rights' societies." I respect woman's rights, but not in the pulpit. I have St. Paul on my side, and when you can answer St. Paul, then I will admit women into the Church.

I stand here now to oppose these calumnies; and I firmly deny them, and, with all the strength of my heart, I call the Irish-American newspaper a liar,—and some of the writers in the Irish-American newspaper, liars. Among other lies, they charge me with calumniating the Irish servant girls in Protestant families, in order to deprive these poor people of the privilege of entering Protestant service.

Oh! coward liars! I never said such a thing! I have the courage to sustain this denial, before this audience and before the world. I did say, however, that in England—in London—they have a monastery belonging to the Sisters of Mercy, in which Roman Catholic girls are educated, for the purpose of sending them among Protestants as Jesuit chambermaids. They are spies, and operate in behalf of the Jesuits. This is true, and I can maintain its truth. But it is necessary to possess the logic of the editor of the Irish-American, to draw anything from this to set Protestants against the Irish girls. I said in my first lecture, that I respected individuals. I had two years in London, myself, an Irish girl as my servant, and I was well satisfied with her services. Therefore, I have nothing to say against Roman Catholic girls, as individuals; but, I have against Roman Catholic girls educated in Russell Square, as emissaries of the Jesuits. And, therefore, when there are leading articles, and stupid letters, written against me on this point—and also a little advertisement inserted, saying, "Don't go to hear this man, who preached against the poor Roman Catholic Irish girls," I have a right to say, you, Irish-American, are a liar, and a liar in support of your archbishop and your Popish system, which cannot subsist without lying.

Now, my brethren, receive my last words for this evening.

Irishmen, you have worked and toiled for the freedom of your country. But remember what I say:—Ireland never will be free, till Irishmen are emancipated from slavery to their priests. Irishmen! free yourselves from your priests, and you will also free your country.—Amen! So mote it be!

LECTURE IV.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

My subject this evening is, The Infallibility of the Pope. I shall prove that it is against scripture, against reason, and against history.

In my lecture next Monday I shall speak of the blindness of the Popish system, and shall answer Cardinal Wiseman in his last lecture in Leeds, and a certain priest in New York, who asserts that Roman Catholics are well instructed in their faith. The infallibility of the Pope is an old subject, but far from being useless. It is necessary to return to this subject in order to prevent the introduction among Protestants of pseudo-infallibility and Popish infallibility, so that this lecture will profit both Catholics and Protestants in America. This infallibility is a point of faith among Romanists; although, if you talk to Roman Catholic theologians, they will assert that it is not a point of faith, and that it is not absolutely necessary to believe or think of the infallibility of Rome, to secure salvation.

But the priests say this to educated people, particularly being in a Protestant country; but in Italy I never heard one word against the infallibility of the Pope. No priest ever admits a doubt of it. In Italy we believe in the infallibility of the Pope, and we are told that unbelievers are heretics, and are only to be found among Protestants; so that when I say that infallibility is one of the most important doctrines and tenets of the Church of Rome, I am only speaking the exact truth. Now it is neces-

nary to examine from what source the Romanist derives this infallibility. We shall find that the same origin and the same text quoted in support of the supremacy, are also quoted in support of his infallibility, and the chief of these is the general ground that the Pope is infallible because he is the successor of St. Peter.

Now we will investigate this point, and ask first, Was St. Peter infallible? If not, how can his successor be infallible? But the Romanists reply, There can be no doubt St. Peter *was* infallible, because Christ endowed Peter with infallibility; and when Christ said unto Peter, "Peter, Satan will tempt you, but I pray my Heavenly Father that your faith may be preserved," therefore, Peter, the martyr of faith, was unchangeable, immutable, and, therefore, infallible. But Satan thought otherwise. He thought him accessible and not immutable, so he tempted him, and Peter really fell, denying his Divine Master three times, and therefore Peter was not infallible, but rather, for the time, was an unbeliever, though only apparently.

I shall prove that all the Christians in early days were called apostles, or rather apostates, when they sacrificed to the heathen gods, even by merely throwing incense on the fire at the altar—an exterior sign of apostasy, which the Christian church thus qualified, whatever might be their internal faith. So that when Peter denied his Divine Master three times, he was an *apostle* or *apostate* in the opinion of the Jews, to whom he thus denied Christ. If Peter had not denied his Divine Master, but supported him, Christ's sufferings might have been mitigated. Peter then really was an unbeliever, that is, wanting in faith for a short time. Was he infallible, then? Was he infallible the last time, when Christ promised him that the gates of hell should never prevail against the Church? That the gates of hell will never prevail against the Church, is true; but the Church is not Peter, for the rock on which the Church is built is not Peter, the rock is Christ himself.

The Church was typified by Christ as a rock, and Simon being the greatest and first supporter or advocate for that Church, added the name of Peter (or Petrus, the Latin of rock or stone)

to his name of Simon; thus he was merely Simon, the supporter of the Church, Christ's Church, and not the church or Petrus himself; and it is against the Church of Christ, called allegorically the Petrus, that the gates of hell cannot prevail, and not against the Apostle Peter. Christ spoke of the Church, and not of the man; and therefore if there is any one infallible, it is the Church and not Peter.

But, say the Romanists, if you do not like this, Christ also said that he would be with Peter to the end of all time. Now, in this case, Christ also meant the Church, and not Peter; therefore, this does not prove him infallible, he nor his successors, but proves simply that Christ will be till the end of time with his Church, sustaining and maintaining his Church against all snares of all enemies; so that the scripture does not prove at all that St. Peter was infallible. Poor St. Peter was a very good man, a warm-hearted, zealous apostle; but he was also a man, and only a man. He was but man when he fled from Christ in his passion. He was but man when he denied Christ. He was but man when he did not assist Christ in Golgotha. He was but man when by his conduct he scandalized the Jews. He was but man in many instances—a pure man, no doubt, but not infallible, because infallibility is a divine attribute, and then it is impossible to err in anything. If, then, St. Peter was not infallible, how can his successors be infallible?

Now for the second question, "Is the Pope the successor of St. Peter?" If St. Peter was infallible, the Pope, as his successor, was infallible. I maintain that the present Pope and the others, his predecessors, are not the successors of St. Peter. Why? Because, to be a successor of St. Peter, it is necessary to suppose that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, which he never was. It is necessary to suppose that he was permanently present in Rome; but St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, and was never at Rome in his life. This is the only conclusion at which we can arrive by deduction and by history. He never was at Rome; because, in the Acts of the Apostles, you have St. Paul in Rome; but St. Peter, never. When St. Peter spoke of Babylon, he alluded not to Rome; and when the Papists say that

Babylon really was Rome, they refer to the prophecies of Revelations, which are not yet accomplished; and maintain that the Babylon of Revelations is the present Rome. Again—we can very positively infer that St. Peter never was at Rome, from the fact that St. Paul, in four instances, writing from Rome, never mentions St. Peter as being there. What is to be inferred from the silence of so charitable and pure a writer as St. Paul?—when, besides, in the whole of the New Testament, you cannot find any allusion to St. Peter being at Rome? You should not believe his presence in Rome by tradition, nor by tales—but only by the Holy Book. Prove by that Book, if you can, the presence of St. Peter at Rome. But, my dear brethren, the presence of St. Peter at Rome is against all history. What monument have we to prove the presence of St. Peter at Rome? The monuments pointed out for this purpose are the same which prove some other superstitious beliefs, such as the Well of St. John, in which mysterious appearances, &c., are supposed to occur. But they are all mere tales.

But we have, it is said, the Chair of St. Peter at Rome. The Chair of St. Peter proves the presence of St. Peter at Rome! My dear brethren, in the Church of St. Mark, at Venice, is the Chair of St. Peter, which he used when he was bishop of Antioch—and it is called the Antiochian Chair. Now, we have this chair of St. Peter at Rome! Notwithstanding that St. Peter was never at Rome. But they tell me that the chair existing at Rome, is the chair of Mahomet, belonging to the sixth century—five or six hundred years after the death of St. Peter! Then there is the chair of the Bishop of Antioch, transported to Venice. So that, possessing the Chair of St. Peter is no proof that he himself was ever at Rome. But, another thing: the chair is not St. Peter's chair at all, but is a Mahometan chair, with two or three sentences from the Koran inscribed on it. Now, as Mahomet did not live in the time of St. Peter, and as the Koran was not then written, it follows that this cannot be St. Peter's chair, but a real Mahometan, Turkish chair. So much for the puerile argument of the possession of the Chair of St. Peter, at Rome! "The Chair of St. Peter," says Cardinal Wis-

man, "is the best proof of the presence of St. Peter, at Rome." Cardinal Wiseman, like a new Goliath, arose some time since in London; and about the same time there arose, also, one *little* David—a female David,—Lady Morgan, who in a book, doing the part of the sling of the ancient David, gave a fatal blow to Cardinal Goliath Wiseman. This book showed that, Cardinal Wiseman had made a great mistake. Poor Cardinal Wiseman! But he is excusable, because he is a cardinal, and cardinals may make mistakes without any imputation against a priest of the Holy Church. This little female David, in her book, proved conclusively that the Chair of St. Peter was a chair belonging to the sixth century—so that this chair was created several hundred years after the death of St. Peter—and could not, therefore, have been the Chair of St. Peter, bishop of Rome. If you have no other argument to prove his presence in Rome than this, you are in a sad way, indeed. Oh! believe me, the presence of your St. Peter at Rome is a gross imposture! And if St. Peter was never at Rome, the present Pope, and all his predecessors, are not infallible—because they were not the successors of St. Peter. Remember, that the present Pope claims infallibility on the ground of being the successor of St. Peter, at Rome. But, St. Peter never having been at Rome, Pius IX., cannot, therefore, be his successor. And, even, if Pius IX. is the successor of St. Peter and the rest of the Popes, he is not infallible. In order to be so, it is necessary, at least, to be Pope. Now, is Pius IX., a Pope? I say, is Pius IX., a Pope? Everybody will wonder at this—everybody having always heard that Pius IX. is the Pope, and that, as Pope, he is the successor of St. Peter. You are not certain, however, that Pius IX., is really the Pope.

In order to constitute a real Pope, it is necessary to have a real bishop, to ordain and consecrate him. In order to have a bishop, you must have a real priest to lay hands on him. In order to have a real priest, it is necessary to have a real Christian baptism. Is Pius IX., then, Pope, after all? You are not certain: and why! In order to be really baptised, in the Popish system, it is necessary to know the intention of the baptizing priest. If the priest administering the water, has not the

intention of baptism in his heart, the infant is not baptized, though he goes through the process. Had the priest the intention of baptizing Pius IX? You suppose he had—but you are not certain: consequently, when Pius IX. was made priest, in order to receive him as priest, it is necessary to know the intention of the priest who baptized him. You suppose his intention; but you are not certain. Is it absolutely known that this priest was regularly constituted a priest? Pius IX. was afterwards made a bishop: but he could not be a bishop without having previously been made a priest: he became Pope, because it was supposed his ordination as a bishop was substantially right. They *suppose* it was, but they have no proof; so that you have no certainty that Pius IX. is really a Pope. You cannot have any certainty about it. Therefore, where is his infallibility? An infallible Pope cannot exist by supposition. He cannot be an infallible Pope, because an infallible Pope necessarily requires ordination, and if he is only supposed to be a true Pope, he cannot, certainly be the successor of St. Peter. Pius IX., then, neither as Pope, nor, as the successor of St. Peter, can claim infallibility; because the Scripture does not warrant the infallibility of the Pope. The only thing, at all clear from the Bible, is this emphatic sentence of David—each man is a liar, but God is true, and the assertion of Christ was for himself alone, “I am the way, the life, and the truth.” Therefore, the only infallibility proved from the Word of God, is for Christ alone, and his infallibility shall be maintained. I have given you the texts said to be in support of the infallibility of the Pope; but I allege that they are in support of what I say—the infallibility of Christ. They mean to say, then, that the infallibility of the Pope is proved by the infallibility of the Church of Rome. Is this a good argument in logic? To be witness and judge at the same time is good logic; but it is necessary that you prove the infallibility of the church, not by the church, nor by the Pope; but by the Bible. If you do not, oh! my dear church, you cannot prove any infallibility. Now, it says, we have texts, but we knew that these texts you bring forward do not at all prove your infallibility. But the Church says, I am the only inter-

preter of the Bible, and I say that they prove my infallibility; ah, it is a very easy manner of proving things, to have always issue or loop-hole. The Church of Rome, whenever it finds an opponent, is apt to argue and reason in a labyrinth or in a circle. In order to prove their infallibility, it is necessary to have the Bible; my infallibility proves the infallibility of the Bible, and the Bible proves my infallibility. Oh! oh! it is a new thing, it is really an art, all these Jesuitical mental restrictions. What is the argument of the Church of Rome? I am infallible because I am infallible; but the Church says, if you deny the power and authority that I have to interpret the Bible alone, in the great variety of interpretation which can flow from the Bible, you will find yourself in a dark and intricate labyrinth. So that they will have it that the Church must be the interpreter of the Bible, because it is necessary to have a guide in the interpretation of the Bible; and to read honestly and rightly the Bible, it may be necessary to have a guide, I allow; but this guide is neither the Church nor the Pope—this guide is the Bible itself only. And, therefore, do not introduce the Church into this affair—an affair of conscience; this is a private affair between man and God, between the conscience and soul of the Christian and the Holy Ghost.

Now, in order to obviate all objections, the Church of Rome said that the Bible is subject to a great variety of interpretations, and therefore the Bible cannot be an infallible guide; but, instead of the Bible, what do they propose to offer to the people by the Popes? Why, the canon law, the bullarium, the canons of the councils, etc., etc. Now the Canon Law is a work composed of 20 vols., in folio; the Bullarium is a work composed of 24 vols., in folio. The Canons of the Councils is a work composed of not less than 45 vols., in folio; this makes nearly ninety volumes in folio, instead of the Bible! If the Bible, inspired by God, and containing his will and law, is subject to so many interpretations—why, ninety volumes in folio, composed by one thousand different men, with a thousand different intentions, in many different councils, will they not have any difference of interpretation? In the canon law, bulls, and councils, will the

Christian find himself equal instruction to other Christians? Ninety volumes in folio! The Papist's theology is a little worse than the tower of Babel. Now, if all these volumes in folio must be the light of mankind, by these blind guides the people will be conducted to a precipice; and as we speak of a multitude of physicians giving a swift passport to the other world to the sick, when one good physician will cure, so in the Church of Rome the multitude of guides will lead to the confusion which reigns among Roman Catholic people.

Permit me now to notice what I call the vanity of the Church of Rome, in calling herself the only interpreter of the Bible.

According to Pius I. the Romanists received and believed in the Bible in the sense received and believed by the Church; and the Church receives its interpretations from the unanimous interpretations of the Holy Fathers of the Church. What is the conclusion? why, that the Romanists have no interpretation, and therefore have no genuine application of the Scripture at all. Why? Because you cannot find the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers given upon any one doubtful point, and on the points you call obscure, they have given no opinion; but on all that is clear they have descanted a great deal. Where enlightenment is needed, the Holy Fathers have found their learning insufficient; but when, my dear brethren, have ever the Fathers been unanimous? Have they ever been unanimous upon the Incarnation of Christ, the Divinity of Christ, the Trinity, or the Resurrection of Christ? Do they not then pay a tribute to the divinity of the Bible, and allow and agree that it is not the Holy Fathers who have made the Bible, but the Bible which has originated the Holy Fathers; therefore, the Bible does not need the Holy Fathers, because the Bible is sufficient to itself and in itself, without any aid from any Holy Fathers. When we want their assistance we have it not, because there is no disputable point of the Bible that the Holy Fathers have unanimously interpreted.

Whenever they have interpreted they have done it differently; when one is on one side of a question, the other is on the other side, and thus you have no unanimous consent to one interpretation of

the Bible, therefore the Church of Rome has no interpretation of the Bible. On this point Father Cyril and Father Basil said to the people, Do not receive our doctrines, but try our doctrines with the inspired Word, and if you find they agree with the Holy Book, then receive them, not because they are our doctrines, but because they are according to the Word of God. This is what the early Fathers say as regards the Word of God, and therefore the Church of Rome cannot claim infallibility, based on the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers to any one interpretation of the text, where it is promised that the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church. The majority of the Fathers recognised that the gates of hell should not prevail, not against Peter, but against Christ. The early interpretation of the Bible, then, is against the infallibility of the Church; sometimes, too, the Church refuses to recognise the authority of the Councils, and says the Councils are not infallible, and then a little while afterwards the Church declares the Councils infallible because they represent the Church. I do not recognise any church as infallible. I recognise Christ alone as infallible, and when the Church is according to Christ it is infallible.

This makes the question, not what is infallible, but what is the Church of the Popish system founded on? In the Christian system the Church is any Christian congregation, large or small. Christ said, "Where two or three are gathered together, there will I be in the midst," and therefore the presence of Christ is promised, not to a large body, but to a few, congregated together in his name. Christ promised to be where two or three are gathered together, not to give them infallibility. Oh, no! Christ never promised infallibility to any one, but he promised to be with them, to help them, to save them. Now this is not the sense in which the Papists take it. According to the most celebrated Fathers and Jesuits, the Church means the clergy alone, not the clergy and laity together; so that, generally speaking, the councils consisted of Jesuits alone, the laity was generally excluded from the Councils of the Church, so that a congregation was but half the Church, since Christ never promised to the entire church infallibility, he certainly did not promise it to half.

Appellinus went further, and says that Councils can make a new dogma, and so confer infallibility; now, no man, no congregation of men can have infallibility in the Church of Christ.

We cannot, and must not receive a new dogma from Popes and Councils at all. We have one Christ and one Gospel, and the Gospel does not recognize any new dogma, any new faith—our faith must be in Christ alone, not in councils, not in infallibility. But the Councils are infallible, says the Church of Rome. Well, let us say they are infallible when they are general ecumenical Councils, but when they are larger Councils they are not infallible.

We have some general Ecumenical Councils composed of fifty Bishops, and sometimes of Abbots, so that we have only fifty men composing the Council; on the other side you have national councils, in which sat no less than two hundred bishops; and now, according to the Church of Rome, the two hundred bishops connected together, for the sake of the Church, are infallible, because they were congregated in a national council.

The fifty bishops, not always brought together for Christ's sake, but for the Pope's sake, are infallible; but, because they are collected from all parts of the world, they are infallible. What should be the number to make up an infallible Council? fifty, say the Italians; twelve, say the Greeks; eighteen, answer the Frenchmen.

If I receive only twelve in a council, the other council will to me be fallible. Oh no, not so say the French; and the Greeks say no, to what the Frenchmen say. The French, however, receive all—even the council of Basle—so that we have a little imbroglio, a little confusion, and one cannot say which are the infallible councils; now, we have a variety of numbers; you don't know whether it is sixteen, or eighteen, or twelve. You have these Councils instead of the Bible, which never changes, and shall never be changed by any man. Generally, these Ecumenical Councils, are all inspired by the Holy Ghost—oh, certainly, yes. But some of these general councils attacked heresies. The Council of Constantinople declares that any one baptised by a heretic, is to all intents and purposes, a heretic. One council

says that the soul of man, is a corporeal being ; other councils are against this. Then you have councils contradicting each other. Know you, oh, councils ! that when a man is infallible, he always speaks the truth, he never changes ; but the Council of Nice, condemned the Council of Trent, the Council of Lateran condemned the Council of Basle—you have the councils fighting against each other. You have the Council of Ephesus, who condemned Uticus, and nineteen years after, a second council at Ephesus absolved him. You have the doctrine that the bread and wine in the Last Supper, are merely symbols. On the other hand, the Council of Trent especially sanctioned the doctrine, that the bread and wine are not merely symbols, but are really the body and blood of Christ. The Council of Basle decided, that the Council was superior to the Pope ; then, another council says directly the contrary. You have a council which excludes the Apocryphal Books ; but the Council of Trent admitted all these books.

Who then was infallible, therefore ? human reason cannot admit an infallible church, insisted on by an infallible Pope. No, no, we have our Bible, the Bible interpreted by reason ; and in order to interpret the Bible, we want no church, no commentaries by the Fathers, no interpretations by Divines—the Bible was given by Christ. The Bible was given for the salvation of the individual ; the Bible was given not to the Church, but to Christians. Christ, said, go, and search the Scriptures ; but go, he said to each individual ; he does not say to the Church, but he says to individuals, try every spirit, the Bible alone is the interpreter of the Bible ; and as the Bible is obscure for some, let them pray God to inspire them, to help them to understand it. Your guide to help you to understand the obscure passages should not be a Jesuit nor a friar, but the Holy Ghost, who has promised to help any one who shall humbly ask his assistance with all his heart. Go to the Bible, study the Bible, fulfil its commandments, pray to the Holy Ghost to give you strength and light to study and understand the Word of God, and you will save yourself, without archbishops, and without Jesuits, Bible interpreters, councils, or Popes. St. Paul, said all inspired word

is useful to save mankind. Now, the Bible and Reason are against the infallibility of the Pope, and we shall see that history also denies the infallibility of the Pope.

Where does it appear that the Pope is infallible? The Pope was infallible, say the Romanists, when his decrees agreed with the Councils. The Pope and Councils together make infallibility, but which is the infallible part? Is it the Council which propounds the doctrine, or is it the Pope who approves it; which of the two is infallible? If the Council is infallible in originating, then the approval of the Pope is useless. If anything that the Pope approves is infallible, it does not need their concurrence. So that if the Pope is infallible, then the Council is useless. But together!! But we have some Councils which disapprove the doctrine and conduct of the Pope; and, on the other hand, the Pope will not sanction many of the Councils. So that, between the Popes and Councils, we have no kind of infallibility; but shall we have infallibility when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*? So Bellarmine says, when a bull is written, it is certain that it is inspired by the Holy Ghost. Let us test this infallibility of the bulls. The first thing necessary is to understand the bull; secondly, to be well informed whether the Pope wrote it himself, uninfluenced by fear; thirdly, whether it was made at the desire of the Church; fourthly, whether the Pope was inspired by the bishop on this subject; fifthly, if the bull was everywhere adopted; sixthly, if any of the bishops refused to adopt it; seventhly, whether the bull is a matter of faith? Let us test the bulls by these seven considerations. We have now these seven points to examine and discuss. I take as an illustration a good simple Yankee, who has no knowledge of Latin; suppose our dear brother Jonathan receiving a bull from the Pope. He don't read Latin, he goes to some one to have it translated. After you have your translation, are you sure it is faithful? As you do not understand Latin, you cannot be personally positive that it is in all respects a true translation; this is the first difficulty. Now, this Yankee, secluded from all the world, must write to every part of the world—to Europe, Africa, Asia, Oceania, to have the certainty that the Pope asked the prayers of all the

bishops, in order to be informed if every bishop gave his prayer accordingly. It may be said, you have a general certainty that this was the fact.

But it must not be a matter of uncertainty, for your salvation depends on it; therefore, you must have certainty in all things. The same epistolary correspondence must be gone through to every bishop in the world, to ascertain whether this bull was accepted or refused. At last, after some twenty or thirty years of investigation, you begin to find out that this bull is infallible; but after having examined one bull, then appears another, and you have once more to go through the same process. How many Papal bulls do you think there are? Not less than three thousand. Try three thousand by seven particular considerations. Then say whether the Papal bulls are infallible; and when you have tried the bulls, what will you conclude? We have many Popes who have been declared heretics. Siberius, Bulginas, were apostates. John II. was condemned by the University of Paris, for many errors. John III. was condemned as a heretic, and Simon by the Council of Constance as a heretic. So that among the infallible Popes, you have many infallible heretics.

Now, what is most amusing is, to have some infallibles fighting with other infallibles for infallibility. You have Gregory I., who first used the title of universal bishop; and you have Leo IX., who proclaimed especially the infallibility of the Pope; while Gregory XIII. proved that infallibility is an illusion. Pope Virgilius declared any one a heretic who believed in transubstantiation; and afterwards you have another Pope, who declared a heretic he who would not believe in transubstantiation. Pius V., by a bull, declared the breviary of the priest to be correct; on the other hand, another Pope declared it to be full of error. Sixtus V., denounced the Latin Bible as incorrect; another approved it as correct; and another said it contained two thousand capital errors. Pius VII., by an infallible bull, established the Jesuits as a body, useful to society; and another Pope banished them as detrimental to society. Ah! ah! where are your infallibles! And this is not all, it is a good deal, but it is not all. This is a great miracle among Romanists—to get honey

out of vinegar. The Romanists admit, among other canonical books, the Book of Wisdom. In that book it is said, that no bad soul shall ever enter into the wisdom of God, and no good soul can ever inhabit a body subject to sin. Therefore, the wisdom or infallibility of God cannot be the appanage of Popes, if Popes are subjected to sin. The devil himself is easier to prove infallible than some of the Popes. I have proved that some of the Popes were heretics, and that some were in direct contradiction to others; and, as I have proved them not infallible, I shall prove that many of them have not been holy. But the Popes are holy, answers the Church of Rome; they are even called habitually, your holiness. The Pope is addressed as to a king; you say your majesty; so to a Pope you say, your holiness. Were you to go to Rome, you would find the Pope residing in an immense palace, surrounded by guards, chamberlains, courtiers, and more than royal state—yet this Pope is called humble—the servant of the servants of God. The servant of God as an emperor, is rather ironical; this man has on one of his fingers a splendid ring, composed of diamonds and pearls, of great price, and this ring of \$8,000 is called the fisherman's ring, it symbolizes the ring of poor St. Peter, which cost perhaps two cents. The Romanists in this country say that the Pope is infallible, because holy, and not only a very holy father, but, therefore, he is, of course, a very infallible father. Everything about him is holy; and in Rome it is not an exaggeration to say, that his palace is called a very holy palace; the gardens of the Pope are called the very holy gardens; the stables are called the most holy stables; the coaches are called the most holy coaches; the horses the most holy horses; you see in the street passing, ten or twelve horses, and if a stranger asks, he is told that they are the most holy horses. I am neither exaggerating nor quizzing; and it is a fact, if you enter the most holy kitchen of the Pope, and question the most holy cook (for he rejoices in the name of the most holy cook), he will tell you that this is the most holy plum-pudding. What is the conclusion? If the Pope is infallible, because he is the most holy father, then the roast beef of the holy father is infallible. This is the conclusion to be drawn,

Yet we are told that the title holy and most holy belong to God alone. And when holiness is attributed to man as Pope, you will not be astonished if in Rome the Church is corrupted till the most ignoble things are called holy. When you say a thing or a matter is holy you must suppose it infallible. What sort of a history is this history of the Pope? You have only one epoch from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, (and I quote the best of the Romish writers,) who say that the Popes living in these two centuries are not Popes but apostate men; and many of them committed crimes of such a nature, as to dishonor not only the Church, but human nature. You have a Pope in the person of Formosus, who invaded the Vatican and there built his altar; after a little while this Pope was overcome by brute force. His successor, Stephen, ordered his body to be disinterred—he dressed it in his pontifical robes, put it in the Church, and questioned the corpse about all its crimes when living. Receiving no answer, Stephen ordered three fingers to be cut off, and the body to be cast into the Tiber. After having been excommunicated—he cancelled all the acts of Formosus, and covered his name with ignominy. Some while after that came another Pope, who reinstated Formosus, and then again another, who condemned him; and, finally, at the end of eighty years, another who reinstated him. So that we have four Popes contending about the rights of their predecessors. After Boniface, came Sextus III.; a worse man never sat on the chair of St. Peter. He was elected by the influence of two women, Morona and Theodosia. This Sextus III., one of the successors of St. Peter, had two sons by Theodora; one of the sons murdered his father, and was made Pope in the seventeenth year of his age. He was called the Nero, the Heliogabalus, of Popery—such crimes did he commit. He gave origin to the great scandal of the female Pope. Thus was St. Peter's chair abused and defiled by monks and criminals. This is the holiness upon which the infallibility is based. We, in Italy, know that many of the Popes were incestuous, libidinous, infidels, and assassins, and committed all sorts of crimes. The last of the Popes, before the present, was an inveterate drunken apostate.

And now for the moral and practical conclusion of this lecture. Americans, thank God that you have no Popes! Americans, try never to have the Popes or their power in your country! Keep your Bible, guard your Bible, read your Bible, fulfil its commands, be faithful to your Bible, and to the Bible alone, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; and if any one introduces human authority, instead of the authority of the Bible, American Protestants mistrust him; he is a Jesuit in disguise. Americans, beware of Satan introducing Popery into your country!

LECTURE V.

CONDITION OF NATIONS UNDER THE POPISH SYSTEM.

Our subject this evening is, What is the condition of the Nations under the Rule of the Popish System? The answer is, they are poor and enslaved. I shall prove this point, first, by the riches and power of the clergy, one cause of the poverty of Roman Catholic countries; and, secondly, by the influence and authority of the Roman Catholic clergy, which is the primary cause of slavery among the Papists. There is a maxim, and it is proved by history, that when a clergy is rich the people are poor. The poverty of the people pays the riches of the clergy. In ancient times we had in England monks and friars, who were very rich, and the English people very poor. We had Spain, Portugal, France, and Italy, where the clergy were very rich, and in the same proportion the people were very poor. In your young America the people are rich, because, still at present, the Popish clergy are poor. No great amount of property as yet has come into the possession of the Popish clergy. (*Cheering and hisses; the most noisy were put out by the police.*) There are policemen on duty, and a good duty they are doing. I have two things to say with regard to this confusion; first, I beg the ladies not to fear, because the noise is caused merely by harmless hisses and the police efforts to quell them, so there is nothing to fear. Secondly, I pray my good friends not to applaud in opposition to the hisses; at all hazards I shall continue my lecture, come

what may. I am an Italian, and not to be stopped by any fear whatever. I shall give an example to the Protestant American. I shall go on my way in spite of the hisses and groans of the asses and pigs of Popery. I have a duty to perform, and I shall brave the battle of hisses and groans. If the papers have no other arguments than the hissing of some foreign b'boys to disturb me, I have a right to say, Liar, answer my arguments! (*Thunders of cheers.*) A little excitement is very good for any one.

Now for the practical proof of this proposition; namely, in the Roman Catholic system, generally speaking, the clergy are rich and the people poor. The practical proof is, that among Protestants you have many religious services without any payment. Among the Romanists (where the Roman Catholic is dominant) everything must be paid for, and without payment many religious services will not be performed; so that the Popish Church was justly called by Russell the religion of silver, the religion of money, for, from the cradle to the grave all is payment. If you marry you must pay. In truth of this, I appeal to Italians as well as Irishmen; they know that, to obtain the blessing of the priest, it is necessary to have at hand five shillings, twenty, thirty, or a larger sum, without which you get no blessing from any priest. In many instances you may have the young couple without clothing or furniture, even, perhaps, no bed, but they must not be without the money for the priest. This is true also of all the other rites and sacraments of the Church. To be baptized it is necessary to have money; to be confirmed, you require money. Indeed, when I was in London I had under my eyes a list of the prices appended to every religious ceremony or sacrament. I shall cite instances of the condition of the Roman Catholic people, not only in the Roman Catholic countries, but also in Protestant countries, because the teaching of the priests among Papists is conducted upon a false basis. Christ, in the gospel, said—"Seek ye first the kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you." Christ, then, does not exclude all other things; then Christ does not exclude property, and the comforts

and happiness which it affords in this present world! Christ only inculcated that, in seeking our worldly comfort, we should not forget eternal life; but this is not the idea among Papists. I remember to have read in England, and also in Ireland—and Ireland, whose people were everywhere so good to me—I remember to have read an anecdote of the great O'Connell. (*Hisses.*) Are you hissing your own O'Connell? O'Connell, you know, was a Roman Catholic, and claimed the independence of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. O'Connell was one day speaking in public, and among many other instances he gave this anecdote, speaking about the primates and bishops of Ireland: "Two Irishmen," he said, "were presented before Christ, one a Protestant, the other a Roman Catholic. Christ said to the Roman Catholic Irishman, 'Will you have comforts, happiness, riches in this present life, and eternal perdition in the other? or do you prefer poverty, misery, and squalor in this life, and glory and eternal enjoyment in Heaven?' The Roman Catholic Irishman answered, 'My Divine Saviour, I prefer poverty in this life and eternal enjoyment in Heaven.' Then Christ asked the Protestant Irishman the same question, and the Protestant Irishman replied—'My Divine Saviour, I desire comforts, riches and happiness, industry and commerce in this world, because if I obey your word and fulfil your commandments, after the enjoyments of this life I shall ascend to Heaven, into the eternal enjoyment of its glory.' " It is for the Catholic's reason, then, that you have at the present day Romanists who reject the comforts and happiness of this present world, only in order to enjoy happiness in the other world.

If you compare a Protestant with a Papist country, you will find a horrible contrast. I was in Switzerland, I was in France, in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, everywhere; but, everywhere, my dear brethren, the Papists are poor, miserable, unclean; and the Protestants, rich and prosperous. (*Storm of Hisses.*) When people who have seen nothing and know nothing, hiss, they show themselves very good specimens of Papist blindness and slavery. Any one coming only from England without having seen Switzerland, where the Protestants are so clean, so

rich, so wealthy, and happy, a reputation they enjoy everywhere; any one can see the difference in Switzerland between the Protestant and Catholic Cantons. If you go from Geneva into the Canton of the Argovia, a distance only of a few miles, you find people well off and comfortable; south of these (in the Grisons) you find friars, priests, and Jesuits, who before they were expelled from Switzerland, lived in squalor, misery, and rage. If Irishmen will examine the thing faithfully, without rage or prejudice, but with reason, they will say this evening on their return home, "It may be severe, but it is true, that in Ireland, the Roman Catholic counties are miserable, poor, and dirty; while the Protestant counties are clean and wealthy. Take, for instance, the Protestant city of Belfast. The Catholics have been as it were overpowered by the industry of the Protestants, who have made it the centre of their extensive manufactories, so that the wealth of Belfast is all derived from Protestant industry and Protestant commerce. When I was in Ireland, pitying this people for obeying blindly the Roman Catholic religion, wherever I saw on my journey, through one of its villages, a Protestant cottage and the Papist cottage side by side, the Catholic cottage was miserably furnished, and in a filthy condition; but I found the Protestant cottage well furnished, with great neatness, looking as if inhabited by human beings.

Among Catholics you always see the same blindness. They are always reproaching the English Government as the cause of their poverty. No, no! Reproach your priests, who oppress and rob you; reproach your priest, and not England; for did not the English Government, in the time of the famine, send six millions of pounds sterling to Ireland?

Now, I shall prove, secondly, that the Popish system for nations is a miserably poor system. (*Hisses, confusion, and more arrests.*) You will, perhaps, say, Father Gavazzi will repent having given two free lectures in New York. No; I am glad, because I study the country through which I travel, and as I bring to your America the facts observed by myself in Italy, France, and England, so when I shall go to my own country, I shall have proof to offer there of the blindness and slavery of

Roman Catholics; proofs derived from these two lectures in New York.

Now, my dear friends, it is a true and logical maxim, that the more influence the priests have in a nation, the less is the power and influence of the people and the Legislature, in that nation; the more power and authority the clergy have, the less rights have the people; so that when I shall have proved that among Papists the Roman Catholic clergy is everything, my logical conclusion will be, that the people are nothing, and their rights are nothing, also. If I were to quote ancient history to prove this point, I should be too long; instead of that, however, I desire to be rather short this evening, in order to abbreviate some martyrdom in this room. But I have one or two things to say about the early ages. Then, in old times, in order to elevate the power of the clergy, ecclesiastic tribunals were instituted, by which alone a priest could be tried, whatever were his crime. Rome, the Papacy, is a kingdom, a temporal power among all nations, so that in France it is the power of the Pope and the Emperor; in Spain the Pope reigns with the Queen.

In England, Papacy is trying to enter into conflict with the power of the Queen—but there it is too late. The privileges of the clergy are no longer there recognised, but by acts of diplomacy of Rome she yet tries to maintain a shadow of supremacy throughout the world. Now it is felt that the constitution of the Popish Church is a monarchical constitution; that the form and substance of the Papal government is essentially and necessarily a despotism and absolutism, so that it is impossible—mark my proposition—that the Church of Rome should support any republican government. Permit me to quote modern history against Papist assertions. Belgium, Piedmont, and England, are the only really constitutional kingdoms in Europe. Against Belgium there is a war, commenced two years since by Rome and the Jesuits, in order to maintain the National Schools in the hands of the Jesuits, who have ruined the rest of Europe, and will also ruin Belgium if they continue teachers of the Belgian youth. And when the Constitutional Chamber of Belgium decreed that the Jesuits should not have the National Schools, the

Pope wrote an encyclical letter against the constitutional government in Belgium, to excommunicate it if they would not continue Jesuit teachers of Belgian youth. The Jesuits are the ruin of all nations. The Jesuits ruined France, Portugal, Spain, Mexico, and Brazil. (*Cheers and hisses.*) Americans, beware of the Jesuits, for they will also ruin you if you allow them. Now in Piedmont the Papal war against the liberal government of this part of Italy was a very cruel one. The Pope, the Archbishop, and bishops were against all civil reforms in the Piedmontese Parliament, and against any step, in any direction, which would secure greater freedom to the Piedmontese people. The Pope made a desperate effort to entangle the new freedom, and to restore the ancient régime of the Papists.

In brief, my dear brethren, the war is only just beginning, from the introduction of Cardinal Wiseman till to-day. The Church of Rome is working against the Republic of Switzerland. A few years ago this people was visited by a great calamity, the war of the Sunderbund, excited by the Papists, and especially by the Pope's Nuncio, so that this republic of Europe was threatened to be overthrown by means of the Roman Catholic efforts against their liberties. Yet, in the face of all this, people will say, but here, the Jesuits, the foreign priests, missionaries, and bishops sent to America—they altogether will work together for the support of the American people, for the glory of the American flag. Oh, blind American people! foreign Jesuits in your country! foreign missionaries and bishops in your country will work only for power, and this foreign authority is the authority of the Pope. This, people will say, is mere supposition! Yes; but my dear Americans, do you believe that we in Italy are without heart or mind? Do you believe that we in Italy are without sagacity and understanding?

I suppose you have a better opinion of my countrymen. You will oblige me, then, to believe that we in Italy have mind, heart, and understanding. Very well. Then remember, that in 1847, when we received our first liberty from our princes, what do you think was our first request, our first act, after having received a Constitutional Charter? Our first request was,

to send away the Jesuits from Italy. We in Italy know that the Jesuits, the freedom of the Jesuits, the independence of the Jesuits, the nationality of the Jesuits, and liberty, cannot go together. Prove to me that the Jesuits, and missionaries, and foreign bishops are being transubstantiated in their policy and nature, when they come here to America. But, my dear brethren, while you are demanding liberty throughout the world, it is at the same time true that the Popish system is against all liberties. I repeat what I said before, that its constitutional form is absolutism, and it is impossible that it can ever support a Constitutional and Republican Government; and I invite all opponents not to get up a disturbance here, because my English is not good enough, I cannot fight with an English speaker, but if you have anything to reproach me with, write and print it, and I will prove it false, my dear brethren.

The Irish are now claiming freedom from the English Government; well, I respect all nationalities, I ask independence for Ireland, for Italy, and for every nation in the world. This is my opinion, without being slave to any government or people in the world; but, my dear brethren, what was the origin of the present state of Ireland? Irishmen so blindly devoted to Popes and Popery—Irishmen, it was a Pope who made you slaves of England—your glorious St. Patrick established an independent church. (*Hisses.*) You hiss St. Patrick! (*Laughter.*) In that you have a specimen of the consistency of the minds of the Papists.

The glorious Scotch apostle, St. Patrick, established in Ireland an independent Church; it was not a church dependant upon Rome; for five or six centuries the Irish Church was independent, without Pope, or the supremacy of Popery. It was Adrian III., who wrote a bull, in which he granted the title of Lord of Ireland, to King Henry II., for which every individual was to pay a penny, as a tribute to St. Peter. Irishmen, know, if you claim liberty and freedom, and hate oppression, you must thank Popes and Popery, who made you slaves.

What is proposed now in Ireland? Are the Roman Catholic priests at present working for the true and honest right of the

Irish people? No! and here, permit me to quote, Meagher, in one of his last speeches here. This young man said, "If the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland had acted like the Roman Catholic clergy in Lombardy, Ireland at present would be a free country." Therefore, the principal reason why Ireland is not free, is the Roman Catholic clergy.

What will you answer—I speak honestly, and address myself only to the honest Irish people—what will you answer to all America, when Europe and America so justly reproach you for the existence in Ireland of the ribbon society? The ribbon society is not a Protestant society, for the name of no Protestant is written in its lists. The ribbon society is a society for robbery and murder. Who does not know that this is not the manner to free Ireland? Preserve your freedom honestly, take care of your liberty rightly and honestly, and the world will say the Irish are right; but do not resort to murder and robbery. Nor can the Roman Catholic priests absolve these people from murder and robbery. I appeal to honest Irishmen to tell me what are you in Ireland with your Roman Catholic priests? You are nothing. You lose even the freedom to vote according to your conscience. I was in Ireland ten months ago, I was present at the hustings, I read the pastoral sermons of many parish priests, I read that they will deny the last sacrament to any Irishman who should vote against their bishops and curates, I read that they will deprive Irishmen of all the comforts of the Roman Catholic religion, if they do not vote according to the bishop. This is the freedom granted by your Roman Catholic priests—you have not even the right to vote according to your conscience and your will.

Finally, what will be astonishing to hear in this country, all the Roman Catholic clergy are against a Protestant government, and in order to have a Roman Catholic government, under which to enjoy the riches, authority, and influence of a powerful despotism, they preach openly in Ireland a crusade against the English Government. Do not suppose that I am here to defend the English government, it can defend itself without my aid, but what I said in England, I say in America,—mark the progress

of Catholicism! I ask the Americans, as a logical people, if a Roman Catholic priest can preach against the British Government, if he can excite the Irishmen against the British government, inviting a foreign government to interfere in favor of the Irish, may we not conclude that the Irishmen do enjoy freedom, for if they were not free, how could they speak thus freely against the government under which they live? They have freedom of suffrage, and enjoy all the liberties guaranteed by the British Constitution.

I was in Ireland when Louis Napoleon became emperor. I heard two or three bishops in Ireland say, we pray God that Louis Napoleon may make an excursion, an intervention with a French squadron in Ireland. That is not all. The Tablet, which in Ireland is what the Freeman's Journal is in this country—namely, a Roman Catholic absurdity—the Tablet, edited by Mr. Lucas, once a member of the French Academy, and whose writings gave him his quietus, making him regarded everywhere as a blackguard; he is now showing himself to be as good a Roman Catholic, as he was before a good member of the French Academy. This Lucas, in the Tablet, said, three months ago, "In the world we have two fields of battle—one is the Protestant field, at the head of whose army is the Queen of England; the other is the Roman Catholic field, at the head of whose army is Louis Napoleon. We pray God that the two armies may encounter, and that Louis Napoleon's army, fighting the Protestant army, may overcome it; so that the Papist flock and faith may be spread throughout the world. And especially we wish Louis success, in order that Ireland may become a French province—and if Ireland should become a French province, Ireland shall be more free under the French government, than she is at present under the British Government." My dear Irishmen, pray God to become Frenchmen under Louis Napoleon, because you will lose all popular rights, having only the sorry one remaining, of having betrayed your dear country to a foreigner and tyrant. Oh! no, the man who took away all the liberties of Frenchmen and France, cannot bring liberty to Ireland.

Now, I am going to conclude my lecture. I shall only beg

the Americans, this evening, and all honest Irishmen, to say when or where, I have said one word against Irishmen? (*Nowhere, nowhere.*) This then is my defence in the face of all accusers, who take pleasure in falsely saying that I excite Irishmen against Americans. No; I wish only to enlighten Irishmen, and to do so I wish to be allowed to speak to them as freely and plainly as I have ever done to enlighten my own dear countrymen in Italy, in order to free them and all the world from such a despotic authority as that of the Church of Rome.

In this Tabernacle, some time ago, it was said by an illustrious Irishman, that the chief duty of Irishmen, in America, is to prepare themselves to defend the American liberties against foreign invasion, and that to prepare themselves effectually for this, they should study the use of arms. No, this is not the main duty of Irishmen in America. It is impossible, in my opinion, that America should be assailed; but if it should, the only duty of Irishmen is not to defend the American flag, it is a duty of foreigners here, to defend America; but it is not the only or chief duty. The grandchildren of the great Washington have no need of any foreigner, or any foreign support, to defend the flag of America; but if an invasion were possible, every nation would rise up to help America in repelling it. I myself, would be among the first to enlist in its defence. Remember, that I bring the Italian cross; no Papist cross, no Jesuit's cross, but the Italian cross of Christ, the tricolor of Italy in our crusades against the Austrians and French.

Now, I will conclude, my dear brethren. I myself, with my companions, will come to defend your flag if it is ever attacked, in order to return and recover the flag of Italy; but the first duty of the Irishmen in America is—the duty of every foreigner in America—to give education to their sons. (*Hear, hear, hear.*)

Irishmen, hear my last advice; make a free use of the National American schools; educate your children freely in the American schools; destroy the influence of the priest in the American schools. America has nothing to fear from a foreign invasion, she has all to fear from the uneducated class of her people.

(*Cheers, cheers.*) And now let me repeat the conclusion of my last lecture to you :

Let me assure you, that Ireland never will be free, till the Irish character is unenslaved, till they free themselves; I say, particularly to the Irishmen, would you free your country from all political yoke, then free your country first from the Papal yoke, and then you will be free !

LECTURE VI.

THE BLINDNESS OF POPEERY.

I AM uncertain what to say, this evening, because a majority of my audience wrote to me this morning, that it would be pleasing to them if I would transpose the subjects of this and to-morrow evening's lecture. Because, my friends say, "We are in the first of May, and obliged to change houses." I cannot change at my own pleasure. If I were in Italy I should take the sense of the audience, and abide by their decision. But, as it is, I think I shall go on to speak about the blindness of Popery, and reply to some remarks of Cardinal Wiseman, and also some pretences of the Papists, that they are alone in the field of battle.

Now the Popish system is blindness. The main point of this subject I proved in another lecture; namely, that the Papists, *volantes ut non volantes*, are without the Bible, and are forbidden to read the Word of God. Since, therefore, the Word of God is the only light in this life and in our world; in a moral and spiritual sense all Papists, faithful to their system, are blind. Certainly, they obey, and that faithfully; but they obey only the authority of their priests, whose authority they cannot resist. Therefore the priests teach and instruct them in all errors, in all lies, in all that is for their own (the priests') best interests. But we will leave this subject, which has already been fully discussed.

I shall prove the blindness of the Papists in the Popish system, chiefly by their worship. I suppose that my audience will agree with me, that any people who are without the Word of God, must necessarily be a blind people. But this is what some Papists deny, but it is what I am certain is true, even in your New York. I learned an example of this, no later than this morning—proving that the priests will not let their people read the Word of God, because, as they say, it is useless. Therefore, I conclude, they are really blind. They believe faithfully in all superstitions, in all works of supererogation, and in the supreme authority of their priests. They are blind, because they have no light; they have not the divine light in their souls. The shadow of the divine light is blighting and cursing this whole people before God. Now, to extend the argument: among Protestants the people are enlightened, because when their priests preach, or speak, or pray, they always use the English language; so that every one who hears the service of his religion in his own maternal language, understands perfectly what the priests say. Not so in Rome. The worship among the Papists is in Latin—all prayers are in Latin—nothing is done in any vernacular tongue. In the household, among relatives, and in the family, they pray in Latin—all sacraments are administered in Latin—the mass, which is the capital point in the Papists' worship, is in Latin. What can you conclude of a church which conducts all its worship in Latin?

Even many among the Roman Catholic priests themselves do not understand Latin—so that they do not themselves understand the very worship they conduct before the people. Generally, in Italy and America, especially among the industrious Papal classes, we find none who understand the Latin at all. Therefore they are obliged to worship without understanding anything about it. In using this Latin service, the priests violate the Word of God; for you know, as well as I, that St. Paul forbade praying in an unknown language; and when Papists pray in an unknown language, they are against Paul and the inspired Word of God. Why, then, do the Papists pray and worship in Latin,—an unknown language? Is it not, that by this technical

form of worship the priest maintains, first, his own authority; and secondly, keeps the people in a state of holy stupidity and ignorance?

Some fortnight ago I read in a Protestant newspaper, the words of the Reverend Doctor Cummings, spoken on the occasion of laying the corner-stone of the Church of St. Stephen the Martyr. In the sermon delivered on that occasion he spoke these fine words, and I am very glad to be able to present them to you. I always take advantage of all topics which arise, as I pass on in my travels, for often, as a collector of interesting facts, I may do some little good in behalf of the Roman Catholics and their worship. I ask your attention to this extract, because it is printed, and so has become a public matter. I have no personalities to indulge against any man, only animadversions upon his published words. He said: "We love the dignified cadence of that antique song, though chanted in an unknown tongue. Yes, we take pride in that majestic Latin service, every part of which we understand. It is not our native tongue, but we love it because it is the tongue of our mother (the church) when she was young, and she has never forgotten it, because she yet has never grown old."

Now, I know not where this reverend Doctor studied logic. I certainly think it must be the logic of Maynooth; at any rate, to me it is a new logic—"We love the dignified cadence of that antique song." That is, because the Roman Catholic Church is so fond of all exterior pomp and gorgeous spectacles. Even in New York, we have a Roman Catholic Jesuitical church, I know not whether in Sixteenth or Seventeenth street, where people say, we have beautiful and fine music. Many Protestants go to this church of the Jesuits, in order to hear the fine music discoursed by the fine orchestra. It is in this way that the devil will enter America, by means of pomp, of music, and of fine spectacles. You don't go to St. Xavier to hear an interesting sermon, an able speech about the Gospel. No, no, this is the church where they go to hear music, but this music is in Latin. Oh! we love Latin, we love this majestic Latin service, every part of which we understand. If I were preaching to

you in the Turkish language, would you say, with Dr. Cummings, oh, we understand this majestic service? You understand nothing, my dear brethren. In your own language, you do understand something.

All you can do is to understand that portion of the worship which appeals to the eye, but you cannot understand the part which appeals to the heart and mind; the spiritual part is not understood, unless you understand the material part of the service. Many people know the routine of the Catholic services—even Roman Catholics themselves know the history of the mass as representing the sacrifice on Mount Calvary. But ask them the spiritual meaning, and they cannot tell you anything about it, because, I repeat, that when English people assemble and hear the services of the Baptist service, they understand what is said, because they know the language; but when they don't understand the language, they cannot understand the performance nor the worship—they leave the houses of worship as coldly as they entered them, without even having prayed from their hearts. This is not all; this reverend father says that, the Roman Catholic flock loves the Latin language in their services, because it is the language of their mother (church) when she was young. But mark the good logic, she don't forget it, because she, not yet old, after nineteen centuries, is only advancing towards maturity.

Now, I ask, when the church was really young did she worship in Latin? Oh! reverend Doctor Cummings, no; you mistake the language of our young mother, young even now, but not among Catholics, but still young amongst the Protestants. The language which the church, our mother, spoke, was not Latin at all; she spoke in Hebrew, for Christ preached in Hebrew, the apostles preached in Hebrew—therefore, the first language of our mother was the Hebrew tongue. The Church varied its language according to the country in which she was established. In Armenia, she spoke Armenian; among the Arabians, Arabic; among the Greeks, Greek; and when she was among the Latins, she spoke Latin; and everywhere she was clear, because she spoke the truth; but in these days the false

- Church of Rome speaks an incomprehensible language, because she no longer speaks the truth; and, in order not to be detected in her imposture, she resorts to an unknown language. .

Come, oh! tell me, Dr. Cummings, if in Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Peter and Paul spoke Latin? But you speak Latin, because it is the language of the Pope; you would speak the language of the devil if the Pope spoke it. (*Cheers.*) From the spiritual and moral ground we come to establish the proposition in a scientific point of view. Popery is afflicted not only with spiritual and moral blindness, but with artistic and scientific blindness.

Cardinal Wiseman, on the contrary, says that the arts, sciences, never flourished so well as under the Papal dominion, in his last lecture in Leeds. Apropos of lecturing—let me tell you that the Papists reproach me for being a lecturer; but Wiseman is also a lecturer and a cardinal at the same time. Therefore, if I am a humbug, Cardinal Wiseman is a still greater. The Cardinal said, in Leeds, that science, letters, and arts, never flourished more than under the Papist system; and the Romish Church is really the mother of all wisdom. In support of this assertion he instances Italy. His remarks were repeated in New York, in the *Freeman's Journal*, with great eulogium. He said that Italy is, par excellence, the country of genius; but Italy is the first country in all Europe for Papal dominion. Therefore, Italy is the promoter, the creator, of great genius in letters, and the sciences. When in my college in Bologna, I learned that a syllogism with three propositions is illogical; but Cardinal Wiseman can make syllogisms with even four or five propositions, because he is a Cardinal; infallible, as belonging to an infallible Church and an infallible Pope. Now, to meet his argument with a similar argument. Ireland is the greatest country in the United Kingdom in two things; it has produced the greatest orators, the greatest poets, the highest scientific and literary men; therefore her "ribbon society" produced these orators, these poets, and these writers. This is a good argument, because the ribbon society is an institution of Irishmen. Now, does such an argument prove that Ireland produced these great orators and poets,

by means of the ribbon society? No, no! The ribbon society don't include the best people of the United Kingdom. The ribbon society only gives to Ireland robbers and assassins. Now, in the same way, if in Italy we have great genius among our people, it is not because we are under Papal domination, but in spite of it. It is not because of the Pope, but because Italy is Italy; and she would have produced even greater and more splendid geniuses without Pope or Popery at all. In Italy, of ancient times, we wanted no Pope to produce Cicero, Tibullus, Horace, Livy, Virgil, Seneca. These arose long before Pope and Popery. Therefore, our Italian genius springs not from Pope or Popery, but in spite of it; it belongs to Italy, and not to the Vatican.

I will now prove that Popery has been the worst thing that could happen to the genius of my country. Do the arts and sciences flourish under the Papal dominion? The Popes rendered themselves often ruthless barbarians in their treatment of the monuments of ancient art. Rome was great by her ancient monuments. Did the Popes try to preserve them? No. The Popes destroyed them. Among the greatest of these monuments are the Pantheon and the Coliseum. The Coliseum was partly destroyed by Pope Barbarini, in order to make room for the palaces of his bastard sons; and the Pantheon was mutilated by Urban, in order to erect the great altar in the basilica of St. Peter. In Rome you will hear the proverb, *Quel che non fecero i barbari lo fece il Barbarini*. What the great barbarians did not destroy, the little one (Barbarini) achieved. What has the Roman Church done to compare with the annals of the civilization of ancient Rome? The basilica of the Vatican is nothing to compare with the basilica of Pisa, built by the Emperor Adrian. If there is anything great in the Vatican, it is the cupola; the idea of which was taken by Michael Angelo from the cupola of the Pantheon. So that after all, we in Italy have nothing to thank the Popes for; but many things for which to hate them. Not only have they not achieved anything for the glory of our country, but they have destroyed the glorious works of her ancient genius, and have persecuted for ages the people of Italy.

2 You know that in Italy we have most magnificent churches, grand and imposing churches. Therefore, is it said that the Popish system protects all illustrious artists. If you go to Italy, you will find palaces, especially in Genoa and Venice, real galleries and museums, erected without the patronage of church or chapel, and these palaces are the refuge and resort of Italian artists. It is true, that for their own sakes the Popes did build many fine churches, and employ many great artists. Why, for the sake of art? No. They cared nothing for the artists themselves, for Raphael sold them his greatest work, his Madonna, for fifty dollars. In that time, this was, it is true, a much greater sum than now, but many lesser works were sold for a hundred and fifty and two hundred dollars.

But why do the Popes admit the works of art into their temples? Because their religion is not a true Christian religion; for when a worship is according to a primitive church, it needs no fine artists, nor splendid churches, nor pictures. God's worship is spiritual truth. The fine arts in churches are preventives of spiritual truth, because, in my country, foreigners come to our churches, not to pray, not to hear an instructive discourse, but to admire the fine arts; therefore, because the Roman Catholic Church is a Popish system, it promotes the fine arts, and so they are always adorning their temples; and wherever you see an ornamented church, you have the best proof that Papacy is entering, and that the church is according to the Papal worship.

Now, I will prove briefly that Popery is no special patron of the artists themselves. Cardinal Wiseman quoted in his lecture, Dante, Petrarch, Boccacio, and Galileo, in support of his proposition. Oh, Cardinal Wiseman! if you speak of Englishmen and English literature, quote whom you please, but do not quote Italian literature, for you know nothing about it. Our Dante was persecuted, and forbidden to be read till about two centuries ago, and the Jesuits expel his work from their colleges to this very day. Petrarch was also forbidden, because he wrote a satire on the Pope, and Boccacio is also forbidden; indeed, every great man is put into the *index expurgatorius*. We have no great historian whose works are not forbidden by the Church

of Rome. Such is the patronage the Church of Rome extends to artists and writers. She forbids their works! But, say the Romanists, these works are wrong, and therefore, in order to maintain purity, the Church has prohibited all these works, and in this way she has always enlightened the people, by prohibiting all the best works in Italy. In our own days the Church of Rome has proscribed the works of Gioberti, Ventura, and Araminio, certainly three of the greatest men in Italy. Gioberti had a work which pleased the Pope, when Pius IX. looked like a Reformer, but when Pius yielded to a superior power he forbade the same work; it was forbidden, because in a preface to one edition Gioberti said that the flight of the Pope from Rome had had a bad effect; and for this, though it was true and a fact, his book was put into the *index expurgatorius*. We have no means of getting at the truth in Italy; indeed, we have no aspirations after truth—we have no men of talent. Gioberti afterwards wrote five books in praise of the Popes and Popery. What are we to conclude, when in Italy, from the day of Charles V. until the present, whenever Italy has produced a great genius, he has been invariably persecuted by the Church of Rome? Genius was not called into existence by the Popes; a child of Italy, it was great in spite of the Pope!

The history of Rome is one of blindness, because it prevents all investigation. For one thing certainly, if for no other, the Pope is entitled to our gratitude; that is, for the careful preservation of our great scientific and literary works, because all such works are forbidden, and stored away in libraries out of the reach of the people.

Sometimes a few privileged persons are allowed to read them; the people can only look at these works, they dare neither read them nor touch them. After centuries they are as new and fresh as if just published; so this, at least, is one good thing. Now is this a government likely to maintain the prosperity of the people? I made, a short time since, a comparison between Catholic and Protestant countries: I spoke of the temporal power of the Pope, and about the material miseries which it inflicts. In Italy we have no social or national enterprises—no railroads, no

telegraphs, none of the progressional institutions. Everything is established to support the Papal dynasty. We have no political or scientific institutions; we have no professorships of mechanic arts, no Sunday schools, no Bible societies. We have no primary schools. In 1847, when we began to have a little liberty, we established a primary school for boys, and in a few months we had several very good and powerful reasons for establishing more; but now they are all destroyed. So you see that Romanists are the greatest specimens of blindness ever seen. Wait a few years and you will see the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant portion of the United States; but what that difference will be you can see by reverting to the Catholic countries in Europe. What is the difference? The Protestants are flourishing, and wealthy, and educated; the Romanists depressed and uncultivated. In the Roman States we have the best soil in all Italy; but what a wilderness—what a desert of sterility and squalor! We have marshes of not less than forty miles, so that, although the Roman States are able to support more than fourteen millions of people, we have little more than two and a half.

[Here the speaker retraced the comparative state of Switzerland and Ireland, as in the preceding lecture.]

In London, if you met in the street a very wretched looking woman, ugly, ragged, unclean, with her hair dishevelled, a child on each arm, another on her back, you would say immediately, this is a Roman Catholic Irishwoman. Misery and poverty belong to Catholicism. Let me, now, produce some general statistics from the census of 1851, of the United Kingdom. A statement of the number of criminals in England. During three months the number was, one for every seven hundred and fifty; in Scotland, one in eight hundred; in Ireland, one in every three hundred. Were they Protestants? No. We have in Ireland, in the county of Antrim, and five others, one million seven hundred thousand inhabitants, six Protestant counties in all. The Roman county of Tipperary, with four hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants. We have in the six counties, two thousand and thirty-four criminals; and in the Catholic county, two

thousand one hundred and forty; so that you have one hundred more criminals in the one Roman Catholic county than in the six other (Protestant) counties. How can such a result surprise us, when you can confess to some stupid priest for any sin you may please to commit, and receive absolution? but among the Protestants, who teach that God is the only Keeper of their conscience, the people abstain from crime.

We promised to speak about womens' rights; that is the American phrase; we do not know what it means in Italy. We know what are the rights of women in Europe. I shall say but little on this subject, women being rather excitable people. Certainly, in Europe, we recognize the right of women not to so great an extent as here; every nation has its own customs, and with national feeling, therefore, I do not interfere.

It is an argument, that the more you extend the rights of women, the better you will become. Ariosto wrote a poem in which he supposes that all offices were given to women, to the exclusion of men. Now, with respect to womens' rights, I hope we have no necessity for claiming more right for women in Italy. Italy has produced more remarkable women than any other country, and we respect our women. I remember one in Bologna, who was a great physician; I knew another, who was professor of Greek in the University of Bologna; and before her, another woman, Laura Bassi, had been professor of Mathematics in the first Italian university.

We have, I know not how many poetesses. We have celebrated women as painters and sculptors. When in Europe a woman has talent it is acknowledged and respected, but further we cannot go. We have many women who devoted themselves to help the defenders of their country against Austria and France. But those devoted to maternal cares are more respected than any.

American ladies, you advocate womens' rights, but you have not found out that the capital enemy of woman's rights is the Papal system; in that women are nothing. What are they in Italy, France, and everywhere where the Popish system rules? nothing, except for occasional display for balls and courts; but

for internal affairs they are nothing. In America men do not attend to their internal arrangements, because the women do it for them. In my country, the master of the house is the Father confessor, the females are nothing: the confessors are the instructors of youth; the people are miserable, because afraid of their mothers and wives, who are bound to denounce all liberals and patriots to the confessor, so that he may report them to the despots.

Our families belong to the priests, by means of the enslaved women of Italy.

One of our great triumvirs in Rome, perhaps the best, a highly respectable man, and greatly honored for his private and public morality, was obliged to leave his home, because his wife was instigated by the Jesuits, so that every time she met him she reproached him, and in order to live quietly, he was obliged to abandon his wife and go into exile with his son.

Take measures to claim rights for the Roman Catholic women; make them enlightened as you are at present, and then advance together in your claim for womens' rights; but as long as you have slaves in the Roman Catholic women, while you allow nuns and nunneries among you; oh! no—abolish moral and spiritual slavery among Catholics, and then you will have womens' rights.

Now, having spoken of the misery and blindness of the Roman Catholic system, let me warn you against a calamity which only the blessing of God can avert.

Americans, are you really persuaded that the Roman Catholic system is one of blindness, intolerance, and imposition? If you are not so persuaded, let the poor exiled Italians inform you of the state of affairs in their country. They will tell you that but a few years shall pass before you will know, but too late, the truth of this prophecy. Thirty years ago, England was incredulous as you are at present, when Wellington and Peel advocated the Emancipation. These leaders said that the Roman Catholics had a right to enjoy the rights of other citizens. The London Times, then supported the Emancipation; thirty years have now passed, and people are repenting the Emancipation;

the Duke of Wellington said, that if he had his life to live over again, he never would propose the emancipation of the Catholics, since it had been made the medium of attacking the freedom of England, in order to establish a Papal dominion.

Americans, without rage, without warmth, but with all the earnestness of my heart, let me adjure you to take warning by England! This is a practical lesson I would inculcate; don't say we are in America, and no danger can happen here; no, you don't know your enemy. That which has happened in England may happen here; beware of the increase of the Romanists in your country. England repents to-day—may her repentance be a warning to America, and spare *her* repentance! Now, the greatest fault that is found in my conduct is, that I am so decidedly against the Papal system. People say to me, more tolerance, more kindness, more gentle words would affect more—a soft answer turneth away wrath.

Some time ago Archbishop Hughes preached a sermon on the Decline of Protestantism in your country. He, a foreign priest in a Protestant country, preached against Protestantism! and in general the New York press reported him in full. Many magnificent leading articles, editorial remarks, and eulogiums, were published about this eloquent address of Archbishop Hughes.

But now comes a Protestant priest, a foreigner, also in your country, preaching on the general increase of Popery in America, and the addresses of this man are mutilated, and he is blamed and censured by the press; he is said to be a man of violence, his appearance will be fatal to America. You remember what I said in my first lecture. I asked, am I in Rome, or am I in America? What was the answer? You are in America. No, not in the America of which I dreamed in Europe—not in the America which I expected to find. No! you do not expect the decline of Protestantism; you do not know that allowing the rise of Popes and Popery is destruction to freedom; you do not know that everywhere the Popish system is united with despotism, and that wherever there is an aspiration for freedom, Popery seeks to crush it under its feet. The fear of all nations is, therefore,

that in America the Popish system will be at last destructive, and destroy the freedom of the Americans.

This is not your fear, I repeat. Heaven bless you, oh, Americans! for your faithful Protestantism, and for your Bible Societies; for these God will bless you. But if you grow negligent and slumber, God will not rouse you to warn you from the abysses which yawn beneath your feet. At this very day the Jesuits, priests, and missionaries, and ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and Sisters of Mercy, are at work in America to blind the American people. You don't believe, when I assure you from this platform, what the Roman Catholics have obtained from some pseudo Protestants. You think the Roman Catholics are an enlightened people, while everywhere they are blinding your children. They have taken the first step towards this, when they are enabled to exclude the Bible from your National Schools! Oh! Protestants, conduct your schools without Bibles—and expect that the rising generation will be enlightened! No! no! If you are enlightened Americans, you are entitled to have the Word of God.

But people say, we have to look after the appearance of this fatal man, pretending to be exciting the people against the errors of the Papal system, whilst really he is exciting the people to civil war and persecution of Roman Catholics.

Now nobody can reproach me with that. But some say, look at Cincinnati, since the arrival of this man, what have we attained there? A Protestant lecturer, who was on his way to deliver a Protestant lecture among Protestants, was prevented by the chief magistrate of the town. The Protestants say to the magistrate, this is not American freedom, to prevent a Protestant from lecturing; and the people insisted on his proceeding, which he did.

This is the bad result of Father Gavazzi's mission. But God will bless my mission, so that if this is the first result it may not be the last. If I had obtained no other result than this lecture in Cincinnati, I should thank God. If America is a free country, freedom cannot be given to Papists alone to speak against Protestantism; but the same liberty must be given to the people

to preach against Catholicism. Some people desire tranquillity, and say we are good, quiet people in tranquil sleep, don't disturb us—we sleep so well we wish not to be awakened by any foreigner.

If the Roman Catholic papers are engaged in this battle against me, I thank God for it. I like such kind of persecution. If the "Freeman's Journal" was now rejoicing in my mission and encouraging my work, you would say Father Gavazzi is a Jesuit impostor. I am not to be deterred by any comments of the press. I am ashamed to be among such Protestants, and I will continue to enlighten the people of America, and to warn them of their dangers.

I have spoken about politicians being led by the priests and archbishop; but I am a foreigner, and must not interfere in American politics.

In my country, however, when we shall have expelled Pope and Popery, in order to prevent a restoration, we will make a law that no foreigners shall vote in Italy until they have lived there twenty-one years.

Remember that I speak of Italy, and not of America.

Now, in this country, Archbishop Hughes has in his hands fifty thousand votes, and that number will increase every year. Some hundred politicians, I don't say at what price, obtain the whole of these votes from Archbishop Hughes, and yet you don't understand or know anything about the Roman Catholic system. To-day, while it is in the minority, a few Protestant politicians may obtain their votes; but when the majority become Catholics, then you will all come under the domination of Archbishop Hughes. Then, members of Congress, magistrates, will all be Catholics; then your politicians who have led America into the power of the Pope, will be destroyed and deposed, to make way for Catholic functionaries.

Now, in conclusion, did you mark what happened last week? When I was in Baltimore, the Romanists strove to prevent my lectures, but they did not succeed. They discovered that when an Italian undertakes to do anything, he will accomplish it, in spite of all opposition. I gave my two lectures without opposi-

tion. You know also that several hireling ruffians were paid to break up my two free lectures in the Tabernacle. Some friends said, after the first lecture, don't give the second, there will be personal danger. But I replied, you know nothing about it; fear nothing for me. I have had so many thousand hisses of real bullets about me, that two or three Irish hisses cannot frighten me. Fear not for me; my mission is in the hands of God.

You have a good police; and it is entitled to great praise for the tranquillity they obtained. It was the intention to prevent this lecture.

Remember, Americans, that if I have done nothing else, I have promoted the Protestant cause, by showing them their interests.

Remember, if I had not given my second lecture, the Catholics would have been encouraged, and have prevented all others. I said I would go to the last before Popery should stop me. If the Papists can succeed in silencing a free Protestant lecturer—no more lectures could be ever given, and there would be an end of all freedom of speech; and in future it would be necessary to obtain a license from Archbishop Hughes. Remember my last words, which I cannot too often repeat. No persecution—leave the Romanists free; no favor and no fighting, but constant watchfulness; because, in a few years they may be in the majority; then there will be no peace, no nationality, no American flag. Oh! my dear Americans, you are not the Americans of Pizarro, but the Americans of Washington!

LECTURE VII.

ON RELICS AND IMAGES.

My subject this evening, as has been announced, is that of Relics and Images. It is a practical subject, and not a theoretical one. I am here to speak concerning the practice of worshipping relics and images. I shall give you, first, a few words in my own language, and shall then proceed to address you in your own.

[After a short address in Italian, the lecturer proceeded in English.]

In speaking on this subject I shall distinguish three kinds of relics—relics of Christ, relics of the Virgin Mary, and relics of saints. The relics of Christ are many in Roman Catholic churches. We have the cross of Christ; the holy handkerchief; the tomb of Christ; the cradle of Christ; the nails of the cross; the thorns of the crown; and the steps of Pontius Pilate, up which Christ ascended, and many others—but especially the nails. I select for animadversion only some of the most prominent of these relics. The nails of the cross are said to have been found by the mother of Constantine. In the opinion of the Latin church, Christ was crucified with three nails; according to the Greek church, he was suspended with four—one through each hand, and one through each foot. But we have one of these nails in Rome, one in Milan, one in Paris, one in Madrid, one in Naples, one in Modena, one in Cologne, and others in

other places. Ten, twelve, fourteen nails, all said to belong to the cross of Christ. In order to support this, the Roman Catholic church accounts for the number of nails by saying that they served to nail up the inscription; so that they are no longer nails of the sacred cross, but of the inscription. You will never find any relic in the Church of Rome, which has not some specious pretext—and certain it is that they need it.

These nails, however, are nothing compared to others, for we have the entire cross—the real, true cross of Christ; but it is necessary that my audience should be acquainted with the practice of Rome. Every bishop must have a small piece of the cross of Christ, which he wears in an amulet on his breast. You have many thousand bishops, and therefore many thousand small pieces are scattered everywhere. We have over all the Christian world no church which is without a piece of the holy wood of the cross.

In Spain, in the Escorial at Madrid, and in the chapel of St. Denis, in Paris, are two great pieces of the holy wood of the cross. In Bologna we have a gigantic piece of the holy cross. In St. Peter's, at Rome, we have another gigantic piece, placed in the basilica, and dedicated to the holy cross. In other places there are other pieces quite as large; so that, if you will join all these pieces together, you will have no longer the cross of Christ, but wood enough for thirty or forty crosses.

Father Newman replies, it is a miraculous effect, because we believe that Christ has multiplied the holy wood of the cross. Ah! I have the honor to tell Father Newman that material nature cannot be multiplied; and, as belonging to inanimate nature, the holy cross cannot be multiplied. But I am told Christ multiplied the seven loaves and five fishes, and made them suffice to feed five thousand people. Yes, but the marvellous loaves and fishes were not the original loaves and fishes, but were another batch. Christ did not increase the original loaves; but other fishes appeared, and other bread, by the miraculous power of Jesus Christ; because, if there had been but ten pounds of bread, not even Christ himself could give sufficient quantity in weight for each person in five thousand people. We know by the inspired

Word that though there were but five loaves and two fishes, Christ, by the use of prestigium or spiritual means, cannot multiply inanimate nature. Therefore I leave the argument to Father Newman. You insist upon the miracle. If there is any miracle in the increase of the holy cross, it cannot be done without some magical power, and therefore is not a miracle; and if there was any multiplication of the cross, on which Christ gave redemption to man, it is by producing other wood; consequently other wood is worshipped with the same worship as the really sacred cross. Thus the Romanists worship, as Christ himself, common wood, manufactured by the deceptions of the Romish priests.

In order to obtain a piece of the cross it is necessary to make a memorial to the bishop. When you apply to him for enough to make a relic of the real cross, perhaps he has none on hand. Well, he can easily obtain this. A knife, a little piece of wood from the arm-chair, a little sprinkling of holy water, and we have the wood of the holy cross, worshipped and revered as Christ himself—such being the injunction of the bishop when he presents it,—for it is the holy wood of the cross (and belonged to my arm-chair). In the same way we have the thorns among the Romanists. That Christ was crowned with thorns is true. But how many thorns, think you, were in the crown? We know from what tree this crown was cut. We have it everywhere in Italy. On these trees are thorns three or four inches in length. Suppose there were eighty, ninety, or a hundred thorns in the crown—there could not well be more—because Christ had not on his head a mountain of thorns; yet we have no great church, no royal family, no illustrious family, no monastery, which does not possess one or more of the thorns of the cross of Christ. So that, suppose the crown to have had no more than one hundred thorns, new difficulty arises, because there are as many of these thorns in Italy as would keep up the holy fire of the most holy father in his most holy kitchen, and roast his most holy beef for a whole week.

You have another relic, the holy handkerchief. It is said that when Christ was going to Golgotha, a sympathizing woman wiped

away the dust, and blood, and sweat, from the face of Christ with her white linen handkerchief, and on taking it from his face she saw impressed thereon the face of Christ—and the handkerchief is at present at Rome, in the basilica of St. Peter. Is there any mention of this in the Scriptures? Do we learn anything in the gospel about this handkerchief? Christ and Peter said something about the desolation of Jerusalem, but they do not speak of this handkerchief; it is, therefore, not scriptural. It is not a logical handkerchief, because Christ, who died for us, was not permitted to be approached, even by his mother, and certainly could not have been by any other woman, when he was going to Golgotha. But if this story were true, have you never seen, when you use a clean linen handkerchief to wipe your face, that the handkerchief retained traces of your face? So it might have been with this relic with which the woman so kindly wiped the face of Christ, so that this pretended image is nothing more than sweat and blood, and by no means wonderful.

This is not all—we have not only one, but several holy handkerchiefs; we have undoubtedly two in Italy—one in Genoa, one in Rome. There is another version or tradition about this handkerchief. It is said that Andreas desired to see Christ, and sent messengers to invite him; but Christ not being willing to go, sent Andreas a handkerchief with the painted impression of his face upon it; so that he was converted by this means. So that this handkerchief may be considered as an apostle or preacher of the Gospel.

When St. Peter was preaching to the Philippians, before Cornelius Agrippa, he showed him a handkerchief of this description, and so effected a conversion; Abigail was converted at the sight of this handkerchief. Now, there are seven of these handkerchiefs, and each of the parties who possess them protests that his is the true relic. There have been many books written to defend and sustain the handkerchief at Rome as the true one. There have been many volumes written about the handkerchief at Genoa. This all produces a very interesting controversy, and in the midst of it all, who can tell which is the true handkerchief,

and which an imposition? The truth is, they are all impositions; and in this connexion, let me mention a very singular and entertaining circumstance for the enlightenment of the Americans. What do you think was the name of the woman of the handkerchief? According to Catholics, it is Veronica. This handkerchief, so venerated now in Rome, is of Greek origin; or rather the legend is half Greek and half Latin. Of the picture it was said, *vera icon* of Jesus Christ, that is to say, this is the true image of the face of Christ; *vera icon* means true image—people say, we go to see the *vera icon*, that is, the true image of Christ. That was especially in early times; but when the Latin language was altered to the Italian, instead of saying *vera icon*, the people said, by corruption, we go to see the veronica, or the true image of Christ; and so the people got it, that Veronica is the name of the woman who had the handkerchief when Christ was going to Golgotha. In the Church of Rome it is necessary to maintain these superstitions, so that we have in Italy many women called Veronica. It is especially a favorite name among nuns, and the Church of Rome pretends to believe that Veronica was the actual woman who wiped the face of Christ. Such is the origin of this superstition. The origin of all other traditions and relics resembles this, and is quite as well founded.

Now, we have the steps upon which Pilate stood to pronounce the judgment of Christ; they are conspicuous in the Church of the Lateran. You are not allowed to go to the summit, but merely to kneel on the first step, and on your knees you may then ascend. Why? Because these steps were ascended by Christ.

Now, Pilate could have had but one step to his judgment seat, for you can still see in Pompeii that the judgment seats of the Romans (the Jews were then under Roman dominion) had but one step called a diomed. These set of steps, however, are at St. John, as I have said, and also another at Bonn—the priest of both places maintains his to be right. Let us leave them to fight it out, and proceed to the last relic of Christ of which I shall speak, which is the cradle of Christ. There is one in Rome, in Santa Maria Maggiore. It has a beautiful shrine, presented by Philip, of Spain; and every Christmas Eve it is placed

on the head of the altar, and the ceremonies attended by the Pope and the cardinals. This is the first cradle in which the Virgin Mary placed the new-born Christ. Its origin is not known.

Father Newman says, in his lecture, that this cradle is as true a relic as the chair of St. Peter, in the basilica of the Vatican, and it is worshipped with the same ceremonies; so let us worship the cradle of Jesus in the true Christian way. Really, yes, Father Newman, the chair and cradle are on an equality with regard to authenticity. I am glad to entertain this general proposition of the reverend father, because the conclusion will be a clear one. We have proved already, in two lectures, that the chair of St. Peter, at Rome, is an imposition, because it belonged to the fifth century of the Christian era; and, therefore, was not the chair of St. Peter at all; it was made four hundred years after the death of St. Peter. The chair of St. Peter, at Rome, therefore, is an imposture, and to worship it is gross idolatry; but the cradle, we are told, has the same authentic origin; therefore, the worship of the cradle is idolatry.

This is the logic I use against Father Newman:

Now, if the Catholics are wrong when they worship with the Laterans such uncertain relics, their worship is worse when they worship those of the Virgin Mary. Certain it is that the Virgin Mary, in the first centuries of the Christian era, was not worshipped at all; it is certain that the Virgin never would have been worshipped, if Christianity had remained in its original purity and simplicity.

Many reproach me as being a blasphemer against the Virgin, and some people predict for me the same end as the heretic Nestorius. What is the Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ? I respect the mother of Christ; I honor her, I love her, but I cannot worship the mother of Christ; I call her blessed, I thank her. I can say of her, blessed is the fruit of her womb—her son Jesus Christ; but I cannot worship her as I do Christ himself; and when I say I cannot worship the Virgin, I am no blasphemer. The Romanists blaspheme when they worship the Virgin Mary; worship Christ alone, invoke Christ, because

Christ alone gave us eternal life; Christ, not the Virgin, can atone for your sins. From Christ alone do we derive our faith, and not from the Virgin Mary; and I am ready and glad to preach against the worship of the Virgin Mary, because the Virgin herself despises such bigotry and such idolatry; worship is due to Christ alone, and to God. If the Virgin herself is not to be worshipped, her relics ought not to be held sacred; in fact we have no relics of the Virgin. The first Christians, not worshipping the Virgin Mary, did not preserve any relics of her; therefore, morally and materially speaking, we can have no relic; yet many are reputed to exist; many, many. We have the wedding-ring when she became the wife of Joseph. It is set with stones, but so large, that the people in the present century say, was the Virgin a giantess, thirty or forty feet high? This ring, they say, is too large for a woman; and so the priests have changed the tradition, and call it the ring made for the hands of both spouses, used merely in the ceremony. This is the new interpretation. We have also the dress of the Virgin Mary; also the head-dress of the Virgin Mary; and, in my country, we have the slippers of the Virgin Mary; many churches, indeed, have her identical slippers; we also have the veil of the Virgin; this relic is everywhere—sometimes it is black, sometimes white—but this is easily accounted for. Before the death of Christ, she always wore a white veil; after the death of Christ she always wore a black one, as for mourning. But you will say, it must have been a very large veil; the Virgin must have been a fashionable lady, who changed her veils twice or thrice a day, and they must each have had ten yards. But, my dear brethren, it is not the veil of the Virgin, but a priestly fabrication. You know not how the Romans patched a little truth with lies. They take ten yards of thin stuff, they put in on the head of a statue of the Virgin; for instance, on the statue at Loretto; it remains twenty-four hours upon the statue; then the priests take it away, cut it into small pieces, put each piece into a shrine, and present them to the faithful as pieces of the true veil. You Protestants say, this is a lie. No, it is not quite a lie, it is merely a mental reservation. It is not

the true veil of the Virgin, while living; but since it has been on the statue, it may be said to be the veil of the Virgin. So, now you know the process of manufacturing relics. This, however, is not all. The Virgin is so kind to her devotees, that she confers on them the best relic you can conceive. What do you think the Virgin gave to Spain and to Sicily—you will never guess it, it is too extraordinary—too wonderful. It is fresh milk from the breast of the Virgin Mary; we have plenty of it in Italy. In Sicily we venerate this fresh pure milk of the Virgin. It is rather astonishing, I am aware. As a good Catholic, I cannot deny the relic; but as a mere Christian, I shall allow myself some doubts as to this milk.

I shall review the belief among both Catholics and Protestants as to where the Virgin is now supposed to be. The Catholics maintain that she is body and soul in Heaven; the Protestants say, she is not in Heaven, but is held in reservation on earth awaiting resurrection. But, in either case can she give fresh milk. Suppose her to be now, soul and body in Heaven; the body is a glorified body—the glorified body can have no milk, and if it could, it could not be deprived of anything, as nothing can be added to a glorified body.. She cannot eat to restore this milk, so as to have some to lose; so if her body is in Heaven she cannot give us her milk. We also know that Christ said, after the resurrection there shall be neither marrying, nor giving in marriage, but all shall be as the angels of God. Now, the angels of God have no milk, consequently the Virgin can have none, even if she is both body and soul in Heaven. But if only her soul is in Heaven, have you ever heard that the human soul can give milk? What then is this said-to-be milk of the Virgin, revered in Sicily by all poor women, especially when they are suckling boys?—why it is an imposition; but as milk is found everywhere, it is not difficult to present milk to the people. It is the general belief that this milk really flows from the Virgin; and people are angry when we exclaim against all this reverence to the Virgin, and such a relic as I am now presenting to my audience. This idolatry among Papists reaches its height in the worship of the relics of

saints. The Papists reproach the Pagans with worshipping animals, stones, etc.; but the Papists, instead of that, worship the ashes, bones, blood, and skeletons of their saints and martyrs; therefore, this is the last degree of idolatry. Within my time, in the reign of Leo XII., an ancient cemetery was discovered near the basilica of St. Lawrence. The Papists said, we have found another catacomb, another cemetery of martyrs. The skeletons found there were taken away, and declared to be the skeletons of martyrs; a few years after, an investigation was made, and these skeletons were proved to have belonged, as well as the cemetery, to ancient Pagans. This investigation alarmed Leo, and he closed the cemetery, and the affair was hushed up in order to prevent scandal to the Church. But the skeletons had been worshipped as martyrs of the Christian religion. This is the character of most of the Popish relics.

Now, I will quote two instances to prove the authenticity of such relics. In Rome, we have three heads of St. Anna, mother of the Virgin, also one in Bologna. Have you ever seen in your time, a woman with three heads?

Now, it is asserted by some (not by me), that every woman has too much tongue in her head, that each woman's tongue can talk equal to five men, therefore, here we have three heads of one woman, consequently, three tongues equal to fifteen. Had she three heads? if not, which is the true head? some of these heads may have belonged to some Pagan women; but to-day, they are worshipped as heads of the mother of the Virgin Mary.

In Piedmont, in the town of Vercelli, in a church dedicated to St. Christopher, the tradition prevails among the Papists, that St. Christopher was a giant, so that in order to have a relic of this giant, the monks called *Umiliati*, (suppressed since the time of St. Charles Boromeo,) found a very large molar tooth, a very gigantic tooth, and this was enclosed in a shrine of gold and silver; for many centuries the Piedmontese, and from other parts of Italy, came to worship the tooth of St. Christopher as a mediator with them and God. So late as this century, about sixty years ago, there was an accurate examination made of this tooth, and it was proved by the first anatomists that it was not

a human tooth; no, it was not; it is still existing, and is shown as a curiosity in Vercelli. It is really the tooth of a hippopotamus—it is a fact; so that for centuries the people knelt in adoration before the holy tooth of a holy hippopotamus, and implored God through the medium of the holy tooth of the hippopotamus; they relied for the salvation of their souls on the influence with God of the tooth of the holy sea-ox. What, therefore, are we to conclude, but that it is Paganism to worship relics, and it is double Paganism when you put yourself in a position to be humbugged into the worship of not even the relics of men, but the relics of beasts; therefore, leave the worship of relics, and worship God alone, in spirit and in truth.

But if the worship of relics is so stupid and revolting, what will you say about the worship of images? The Papists say, in the face of the second commandment, that it is right to worship images; and it is also true, that in order to worship images they must entirely violate the second commandment of the decalogue, and you cannot find in all their editions of the Bible the second commandment at all. Still, they pretend to have the ten commandments the same as the Protestants. Yes, ten commandments! But, though the Bible system is a connected system, the priests of Rome took the last commandment of the decalogue, and like good upholsterers, cut in pieces the last commandment in order to eke out the ten commandments.

The second commandment, which forbids the worship of images, is cut off entirely, and the last commandment is divided, so that their ninth commandment says—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife;" and the tenth, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's ox, nor his ass," &c. In this way they justify themselves for the worship of images. They also say, we do not worship really the image, for the visible object is only an emblem of the original object of our worship. But even under that interpretation they are idolaters, because Christ forbade the worship, not only of material objects, but also human objects—such as saints; all human objects, even the angels—all, all are forbidden, for God alone is God, and he alone shall be worship-

ped by mankind; therefore the worship of any object whatever is idolatry.

It is usual to make pilgrimages to worship these images of the Papists. They go rather to an image than to an altar, and in order to satisfy all people, the Virgin Mary assumes different complexions in different places. In Rome she is white, in Bologna she is brown, and in Loretto she is black, so that every race can choose its own color. Here are more miracles, because it is a fact that some images are miraculous. We have in Rome, at the Franciscan convent, a little baby. It is said that this baby belonged to St. Frances Domitius, to whom it was sent from heaven on Christmas eve to personate Christ, the new-born Christ. Therefore this little baby was manufactured by the angels. It is rather more like a monkey than a baby, so that one must conclude that the angels in heaven are no great artists in the baby line—still they persist in the divine origin of the baby. On Christmas eve this baby is produced by the friars, and made an object of special worship. The great bishops, and even the Pope himself, send for this baby when they are sick, in order to regain their lost health through its means; it is, therefore, called the little physician. This ugly baby is very richly dressed by the Roman ladies. You cannot find a queen arrayed in such rich diamonds, in such gems and jewels. But after all, it is only a wooden doll. Such is the worship of images.

You have Santa Filomela, discovered some years ago in Rome. Her remains were enclosed in a doll made of rags and papier mâché. It was carried to a church, and one night (these miracles always take place in the night) from pale she became blooming and healthful. Another night some beautiful curls appeared on her head, and the hair grew so long that it reached to the doll's feet, so that at last it became necessary to cut the hair, in order to prevent its covering the whole shrine; and all the people were lost in admiration of the miracle, a miracle performed by rags and papier mâché.

In the church of St. Peter, under the top cupola, you have a brass statue of St. Peter in the act of blessing the people. This

statue is worshipped by all, but more especially by the Roman clergy, and twice a year by the Pope himself, in great pomp.

This St. Peter presents his foot, and all the people go and lay their foreheads on the foot of St. Peter in order to obtain their eternal salvation. This St. Peter, however, in the times of old Rome, was a statue of Jupiter. This St. Peter was originally made by a Pagan artist, established in a Pagan country, worshipped as a Pagan, and as a Pagan god. The Papists have only changed the name; and when the priests kneel before this St. Peter and kiss his toe, they kneel and kiss what once was Jupiter. And if the ancient Romans were called Pagans because they worshipped this image, you, oh! modern Romans, are Pagans when you worship this Jupiter, whom you call St. Peter. Therefore, to worship relics is a Pagan practice, and must be excluded from the true Church of Christ. This is the reason why, in my last lecture, I exclaimed so loudly against all exterior signs of worship; and this is the reason why I protest against the practice of many Protestants wearing distinctive marks or symbols of Christ.

People say, you do not practise what you preach. At the same time that you are denouncing crosses you wear a cross on your own breast, therefore are you illogical.

Why do you not begin your reform by yourself? By myself! This cross is not a Papal cross, not a Puseyite cross; it is the banner, the emblem of our Italy, like the stars in your flag. Each town and city has its own special emblem, and many towns have a cross as their emblem. The armorial bearings of the town of Genoa is a cross; those of many illustrious families have often crosses in their quarterings, but it is not a Papal cross. If ever my Italian brothers have another banner I will adopt it, and change this; but as long as my country recognises this symbol of their independence, it reminds me of my duty against Austria, France, Pope, and Popedom. But my Italian cross I will not abandon whilst it has this meaning. This robe is my robe of mourning for our brethren of Lombardy. It was given us by our mothers and sisters in Italy, when we were marching against

Austria to free Lombardy from its oppressors. We love our symbols, then, and have a reason for it. Each morning it reminds me that I am an exile, and that I have duty to achieve and injury to revenge for my brothers, murdered by vile assassins, now cold and motionless upon the plains of Lombardy. Mine is no socialist cry, but a legitimate, national appeal. Away with all foreigners from Italy,—let us be a free and independent nation. But if I am right when I retain my cross, which is neither Papist nor Puseyite, it does not follow that you are right when you accustom yourselves to crosses which are both Papist and Puseyite. So I repeat, you American ladies, know not that crosses are Papal snares in your country.

The Papists begin by inducing you to wear fine crosses, and then afterwards they get you to worship some images, &c. Many American ladies, from indulging in what they suppose an innocent fashion, will at last become Papists.

When I was in London, the symbols of faith, hope, and charity, were introduced, and the ladies wore them as a fashionable bracelet. Many of them adopt the crosses as a mere innocent fashion, and in the course of two years all these people are Romanists.

Therefore avoid and expel all Papal symbols from your daily customs. Choose some better device. Wear on your breast your American eagle, put around it an American motto against Popery; and if it is not right to wear a cross on the breast, it is worse to have them on the spires of American churches.

You may say, it belongs as much to one church as to the other. Remember, however, that Protestantism in early days had no crosses. Knox and Cranmer had no crosses. Crosses are for the Protestantism of the present day, because it is on the decline; and in certain quarters, the cross is the sign of the intermediate state between Catholicism and Protestantism. Now, I respect the cross, and when it shall be no more an exclusive symbol of the Romanists and priests, when we shall all be in our graves, the cross can cover the remains of those dead in Christ, with great propriety; but as long as the Romanists use a cross to distinguish their churches from those of the Protestants, those Pro-

testants who adopt it will soon be converts to Romanism. Beware, also, of pictures and statuary in your Protestant Churches. It is said, that these statues and pictures may represent the histories of our forefathers. When the Councils of Nice and Constantinople forbade the use of images, it was objected that they represented our apostles and our martyrs. Were you to introduce pictures and statuary into your Church now, Protestants in a few years would worship them; and so you will pave the way for future idolatry. No, as an Italian I admire and respect works of art; but I say, place them in museums, galleries, private residences, and public buildings, in order to make them the glory of your country; but take them away from our churches.

We have the Gospel of Christ, the Commandments of the Decalogue, the divine Our Father who art in Heaven, and these are all sufficient; these are the inscriptions to engrave on marble in your churches; these must remind you of your duties towards God and man. Away, then, with all statues and pictures from all Protestant Churches. Christ, alone, is the only Divine object of worship.

LECTURE VIII.

PIUS IX.

THE subject of this lecture is Pius IX. I shall show that the moral and political character of this Pope has been fatal to the Church and to Italy. I beg to inform my audience, that as I am about two great works, I cannot deliver any lecture next week as I had previously proposed. I have now provided for carrying out a plan which very much occupied me, of establishing the first Christian worship for Italians in the United States; this has been a difficulty; and now I have other work, and as I am not St. Anthony of Padua, and cannot be in two places at once, in order, therefore, to establish this here before leaving New York, I must take leave of my audience this week, so that the last lecture in New York will be next Saturday, after which I shall never address you again, in your hospitable town.

To-night, I am to speak of Pius IX. Who is Pius IX.? He is a man only, a man and nothing more—some people mistake Pius IX. for an angel. No, no; he is really a man; nay, often less than a man; his character has to be considered morally and politically, and we must consider him in his public and private capacity, but more especially in his connexion with the Church and with Italy. Now, in a few words, my dear friends—Pius IX. is a priest. What, has he been a priest?—what, will he ever be a priest?—What do you mean when you say, Pius is a priest, a Roman Catholic priest? Nothing, nothing for good purposes, all

for evil. Speaking with one of his own brothers, six months before I went to Rome, he said to me, "My brother is a priest; as an obscure priest, perhaps, as a parish priest in a village, my brother could have done some good; as a priest of the highest order, he would, no doubt, be charitable; but as he has a very little mind, 'a very leetle small mind,' he will make a very bad pontiff, because his mind is not well balanced; there is no equilibrium between his heart and head, so that the result must be bad. When a priest has a good heart but a weak mind, his rule must always be a feeble one. The last speaker is always right with such people, so that we shall have a very bad pontifical government."

And so it has come to pass. We have at present a very bad pontifical government, because during the last two reigns the real sovereigns of Rome, were the Secretary-general, Cardinal Antonelli, and Rothschild, and the ambassadors of Austria and Bavaria. It is true that Pius IX. gained considerable reputation by his first acts of amnesty. But the American people are not aware of the motives which called them forth.

When Pius IX. was archbishop in a town near Bologna, where he resided some years, he relieved all misfortunes, consoled all sorrows, and did so much good that it promised well for him, when he should be Pope. When the cardinals were in conclave, deliberating on the election of a Pope, one cardinal said that it would be necessary that the new Pope should grant an amnesty, because without this it would be impossible for him to reign. Therefore, the act of amnesty was the work of the same man who, under the reign of Gregory XVI., was the instigator of all his tyranny, I mean Lambreschini. Now, if Pius granted an amnesty, he, therefore, merely paid a tribute to necessity, and this act was not prompted by his heart. He did it because without it, Rome would have received him silently and coldly. Many things are known of him both in America and England, but not everything. You have heard the poetical things in our life, and left out the practical deeds. It is always customary at his coronation to grant some good things to the Roman States. This has always been the custom; but when Pius became Pope nothing

was done for the Roman States, so that Rome, which did not know Pius before his elevation, still remained silent and cold when she found that he did nothing for her advantage. Pius IX., who loves applause and cheers, is altogether a theatrical character, who would feign pass his existence among the applauses of his audience,—when he was received so coldly and so silently by the Romans, said, “Why do I not deserve applause? Why do not the Romans applaud me?”

Circumstances were favorable to Pius, when he commenced his reign. He had a nephew in Rome, who, with his family, were good-hearted people; and it was by their advice that he was at first induced to grant an amnesty, and thus to regain the ground he had lost. So you see, the act of amnesty, which attracted the attention of the world, was an act of necessity, and not prompted by the goodness of his own heart.

In order to ascertain the true character of Pius IX. I will now make some statements of his duplicity of both heart and mind—what in Italy we call *male fide*. When the act of amnesty was sent to the provinces, the Secretary of State wrote instructions to all the governors, by order of the Pope himself, to put every obstacle possible in the way of fulfilling its conditions. This is a fact; because in Bologna, the people reproached the legate there for not making public the amnesty. This cardinal, in order to excuse himself, showed the order from the Secretary of State, by which he was enjoined to put every obstacle in the way of the amnesty. This was the first time in his reign in which he manifested that *male fide* which he has since so often shown. But, so astonished were the people by the publication of the act of amnesty, that all hearts were gained by the Pontiff; and there was a general return of that sympathy and affection which had for so many years been lost to the Pontificate. The result was, that in Italy there was really a general revival of the ancient Popish faith, especially among the young men; the whole population beginning to follow the rites of the Church with such strict observance as had not been seen before. But all was again lost by the Pope's apostasy. Now, it is necessary to watch his acts, and to look at every one of his acts, and a

all the movements of his life—a life which ought to have been true and faithful. We must speak now of the *male fide* of Pius IX. We shall have many instances to offer of the arts of one whom his father confessor calls Monsignore; he possesses the priestly art of saying one thing, when he means another. I, myself, was once imprisoned by order of Pius IX.; not for immorality, thank God, but for having spoken against the court of Gregory XVI. When in Rome we discovered the plot against reform, by Pius IX., supported by the whole court and the Jesuits; and, therefore, when I spoke in the court for three days, Pius, ever the priest, ordered my imprisonment. I was not consigned to a very severe monastery; but having within a few days received more than one thousand visits of condolence, Pius said it was necessary to transport to another place this dangerous man. This was on the first of February. A great friend of Pius IX., then Governor of Rome, at that time Minister of Police, tried to obtain my liberation. Pius IX. promised to grant it, and gave his Pontifical word, that on the next morning—namely, the second day of February, I should be released. I got this good news through a brother of mine, and went to bed in better spirits than I had done before. At midnight, people came and knocked at my door. I went to see who was there, and saw two ruffians. I was not to be frightened by two ruffians. But Pius IX! I was among the admirers of Pius IX., even though he had imprisoned me. Therefore, judge of my surprise when I asked, what is your business, and they answered, we are come for you.

“Where?”

“We cannot tell you.”

“Then, if you can give me no satisfactory account of your intentions, I shall not go with you.”

Then there was a struggle, and finding I was too strong for them, the ruffians said—

“We are going to take you to Gensano, a distance of twenty-five miles from Rome.”

Very well. It was a very cold night. We went out of the

prison, and found a carriage near the Coliseum, and two or three hours after midnight we arrived at Gensano.

In the morning the students and a multitude of people waited about the prison for the appearance of Gavazzi in Rome, but no Gavazzi appeared. They then went to the prior of the monastery to inquire after me. The prior informed them that Gavazzi was no longer there, and that he knew not where he was. The friar did know, but then he was a priest, and they could not find me for five days. After five days the people learned that I was in Gensano, and in ten they obtained my release. Now this is a specimen of the good faith of Pius IX.! this is the infallible word of the infallible Pius IX.! Now from this case, if you take a general view, you will find in all the acts of Pius this double dealing, this *male fide*. I will quote especially two of his encyclical letters—one written at Gaeta, another from Portici.

In the first of these letters the Pope ordered that there should be no universal suffrage allowed in voting for the Roman assembly. He quoted a decree of the Council of Trent, section 21, which says that it would anathematize any one who should take any property belonging to the church. And upon this basis he wrote this encyclical letter, and says in it, that any one who votes for the deputies he will anathematize.

Now this is a perversion, because when the Council of Trent spoke of the property of the church it spoke of the revenues of the bishops, the revenues of the church being especially for the pope and the bishops. What, therefore, had this text to do with his encyclical letter, which was to prevent the people from voting? First, the Roman States are not an ecclesiastical property, they are a real state, and the Pope in Rome is not only the pontiff, but also temporal prince and king. The Roman States, therefore, not knowing that it was a lie, not understanding Latin, and not having at hand the decrees of the Council of Trent, obeyed the Pope, believing that he quoted and gave the true meaning of the decree; and therefore many abstained from voting in order to escape the threatened excommunication. Others braved it, and voted in spite of it. The great majority laughed at such a lie, and voted according to their con-

victions. But this is the *male fide* that he practised in order to carry out his plans.

His second encyclical letter he wrote about the French, and against the Republic. He was not satisfied to have overthrown the republic, which arose out of his cowardly flight from Rome, by means of the French accursed bayonets. He wrote an encyclical letter against the republicans, in which he calumniated the republican government and its acts. He calumniated them when he said, that in the time of the republic the Roman Catholic clergy were despised, and that the Catholic prelates in Rome had no authority in spiritual matters—lie! lie!!—because the few monks and the few priests, not more than eight or ten out of the whole body of the clergy, who did dare to present themselves before the Roman people, were everywhere respected, and treated among the Romans with special attention. The people, indeed, paid great honor to these priests.

I saw these priests in Rome disguised as country-people and as private gentlemen—not out of fear were they disguised, but to escape the trouble and fatigue of receiving the attentions of their fellow-citizens during the siege. We could not find more than thirteen or fourteen father confessors in Rome, and these were well treated. All the others had fled from Rome. It is a lie, then, to say that we despised and ill-treated the monks and priests! We respected them at that time in Rome. We implored the assistant vicar of Rome to pray with us, and to celebrate mass in the Vatican to the whole assembled republic, but he refused to accede to our wishes. He said, I cannot celebrate mass when the Pope is in exile; so it was necessary for us to take some of the military chaplains to perform the solemn function, instead of having the Pope, then on the balcony of the Vatican, honored with flags and banners. We received the blessing of the holy sacrament from these chaplains. I, as one of them, spoke as a Papist, and presented the consecrated wafer. This was a good exchange for the Romans; because, instead of having a blessing from the vicar of Christ, they had it directly from Christ himself. Thus, you see, we were good Papists in the time of the republic. Nor is this all. Pius, in his encycli-

cal letter, accused the republicans of having deprived their dying brothers of the last sacrament—the republican soldiers! It is impossible to find a more ignominious and revolting lie than this. I am an exile now for no other crime than that of having assisted my dying brethren in Rome in administering the last sacrament, and the other priests who did so were imprisoned and subjected to the severest penalties in Rome, because they assisted their dying brethren in the same manner. Therefore it is a lie, a wilful lie, asserted wilfully by the Vicar of Christ!

What were the wishes of the Vicar of Christ and the Cardinal Vicar of Rome? They wished that all our soldiers should die without the sacrament, because they said afterwards that they were all excommunicated, all infidels, and all eternally damned!

If they received the last sacraments, they say Father Gavazzi and the other chaplains had no authority to absolve the dying soldiers. No authority? I, as a Papist priest, received my authority on the eve of my departure from Rome. I received it from the Pope's own brother, and I therefore was endowed with an authority which never had been taken from me. So all the priests in the churches at Rome advised me to absolve the dying brethren; and, therefore, when Pius IX. wanted to prevent my absolving them, it was a cruel revenge against the glory of Italy. This is not all. This Pope in his encyclical letter insulted our Italians, especially our Roman women.

When the French approached Rome, when the Roman Assembly decreed to resist the French invasion, I caused hospitals to be prepared for our wounded brethren. But in order to be charitably assisted I appealed to the Roman ladies; and, in less than two days, six thousand Roman ladies signed a paper, in which they pledged themselves to assist gratuitously the wounded and dying in the hospitals, and they faithfully fulfilled their promises. They were six thousand angels at the dying beds of our Roman soldiers. By their kindness, their gentleness, their affection, they consoled the last moments of those who had so nobly laid down their lives for Italy. These six thousand women-angels from heaven—in purity of character—from all classes of society—these six thousand ladies, so cheerfully benevolent, so full of

charity, were called by Pius IX.—what do you think?—six thousand prostitutes! Oh! American women, arouse your indignation against this Vicar of Christ in such a cause, in defence of your insulted sex, against the priests of Rome. Such is the moral character of this so-called Vicar of Christ. We have from him every species of immorality. He fled from Rome in company with a woman. His guardian angel was a woman. St. Peter, when he was delivered from prison, had an angel from heaven as a guide—but the guide of Pius IX. from Rome was the wife of the Minister of Bavaria! When danger came near Rome, if he had been the true shepherd he should have remained in Rome; but because he was a false shepherd he fled, and sought the protection of the Neapolitan tiger.

All kinds of public and political immoralities have been committed by Pius IX. He blessed the Ozar of Russia and the newly made Emperor of Austria, because they helped to restore him to his throne, but with the same tongue cursed Belgium and Piedmont because they were escaping from the usurpations of Rome. More than this; Pius IX. entered the hospitals of the wounded and gave them his especial malediction. But to the French who were wounded, Pius distributed rosaries, medals, and crosses of honor. He did this to the Frenchmen who killed his subjects. At the same time he allowed the bones of our soldiers to remain unburied; so that to this day the traveller is disgusted to see, without Christian burial, the bones of so many Christians, merely because they were excommunicated, and belonged to the accursed. Such is the Vicar of Christ! This is he who was cruel enough to shut up in a prison of Rome an affectionate mother, because she was found shedding tears over the grave of her only son! If Satan has a vicar in this present world, he is certainly to be found in the person of Pius IX.! This is his moral character!

Even if you were to doubt his character, you cannot doubt or change the character of his government. Pius IX., as I have said, is merely a poor priest. A priest even when talented is always a bad politician, because it is not the proper sphere of the priests to be in politics. Therefore, the good clergymen remain

with the churches—bad clergymen make their way to the forum; therefore you have there all bad Jesuits, and when they get into the forum they are bad politicians. Pius IX. is not a good politician, and is a very bad priest. The weakness of his mind produces the misery of his subjects. What can Italy obtain from such a Pope? Neither nationality, nor independence, nor liberty.

When a son loves his mother he speaks ever of his mother, he seeks her society, he caresses his mother, and before he sleeps he seeks the blessing of his mother, in his sleep he dreams of his mother. Such is a good and affectionate child. Now when a man loves his native country he devotes his heart to his native country; he speaks for it, he works for it. If Pius IX. had been a good Italian he must have loved his dear country.

But look at the first advice he gave me in 1847, the first time I was presented to him, in a private audience, by his brother.

I spoke of Italy, and said, all Italy is looking to you. And he replied, oh, Gavazzi! don't talk to me of Italy—Rome, if you please! I felt like a man who, on the point of drinking a good glass of wine, finds it is iced water.

"Not Italy, holy Father? What will you do for the Romans?"

"I will do for them what I can, but don't speak to me of Italy."

"From this moment I began to be suspected. I was watched narrowly, and when I was asked to preach on the day of the coronation, in "*Santa Maria degli Angeli*," my sermon was revised by the Cardinal Vicar of Rome before I spoke it, and wherever the name of Italy was found it was struck out; and I was ordered to have two copies prepared, one for my own study, and another in order to see if I omitted the parts which the pen of the inquisitor had erased. When I spoke of Italy in the University, the result was that I was imprisoned, as I before stated; therefore Italy was really a word forbidden by Pius IX. What can you expect from such a Pope, when nationality was proscribed?"

When I was in Rome, my countrymen sent me a beautiful tri-coloured flag, and the Roman people were about to receive with honor the banner that came from Bologna, and great preparations were made; the military and music were collected, and not less than twenty-five thousand people assembled to receive the Bolognese flag. Oenato carried the Bolognese flag; when the Pope appeared on the balcony, we said, here, Holy Father, is the banner from Bologna. Pius IX. never even looked at this flag, to bless the tri-colored banner of Italy.

When all the Italian flags were being taken to the Quirinal, we found that at the foot of the Quirinal were posted *gens d'armes*, to prevent any one from going to the Quirinal. So that, except for the sake of popularity, when he affected it, there was no true feeling of nationality in his heart.

One day, he blessed Italy from the balcony of the Quirinal; and another day, he said, we rest satisfied that God will bless Italy; but it was a magic word. In a few hours this magic word spread throughout Italy—even to Sicily; and everywhere the people said, God must bless Italy, that is so blessed by his representative. And then all arose to achieve the independence of Italy. In Rome we preached the crusade. I went to Pius before we marched, in order to obtain his blessing for the cockade. He replied, I cannot give my blessing to this cockade. After this we marched to Venice, and we suffered bravely for more than forty days. On the eve of our first struggle with the Austrians, we received notice that Pius IX. had signed a treaty with Austria. Therefore, our crusade was cut off, and we were no longer the right hand of Charles Albert. This was our first real disaster—the apostasy of Pius IX. A descendant of St. Charles Borromeo, an exile in Piedmont, wrote that Pius was really for Italy; because he called the cause of Italy, safe, just, and right. You call the cause of Italy, safe, just, and right, and then you abandon it. You call it right, and afterwards you betray the Italians into the hands of the Austrians, and other foreign invaders. Ah! when we think that Pius IX. persecuted the work we were achieving, because the Austrians were the children of the Pope, we cannot but look with contempt on such

subterfuges. The Pope said, I cannot make war with the Austrians, because the Austrians are also the spiritual sons of the Pope. But, after a few months, this Pius himself, who refused to make war with Austria, because her people were his children, himself, he made war upon his own children at Rome, and slaughtered thousands and thousands of them by means of the French troops, the Spanish and the Neapolitan armies. So that the Pope, who deprived Italy of the crusade against the barbarians, made a barbarian crusade to deprive Italians of liberty.

Now, what can you expect from such a Pope? Certainly his first acts appeared to the astonished world a very good beginning. But know, ye people, that this reform was obtained from Pius IX. by our flatteries and applauses. Oh! if any in my audience had been present in Rome at our banquets, he would have seen that we spoke the truth. When we asked reform, Pius always answered, no! We assembled together in council on the Piazza del Popolo, a square near the Via Faminia. We had music and torches in our procession. The next day ten thousand people met on the Piazza del Popolo. We marched in good order to the Quirinal, with a military band at the head of each thousand of people; four or five thousand torches, and twenty thousand candles. Before we reached our destination, this procession increased to about forty thousand. Then there were shouts of applause and vivas to Pius; and, in about half an hour the great balcony was opened, and Pius IX. appeared, followed by a regular procession of prelates and cardinals. They were enthusiastically received by the crowd. The Pope implored heaven, and gave us the desired blessing. It was quite a theatrical exhibition; because, when Pius IX. came to pronounce the blessing, the air was illuminated with red and blue fires, as in a theatre. When Pius gave his blessing, we put our torches out, so that the square got very dark. Then from the palace of Prince Colonna arose a stream of fire, and all the sky was illuminated; and when Pius IX. said, God bless you, the color of the fire was changed, so that all looked white. Then our petitions ascended to him, and he granted them, for he feared the cannon; and all we ever obtained from him was obtained in this

way; not from the heart, but from the applause of the Quirinal.

If you, as republicans, and as a free people, look seriously at our affairs, you will see that our reforms were unsound, superficial, insufficient. After three principal reforms had been granted, the Cardinal Minister said, this is sufficient. You must now stop. Oh! yes, if you give to a thirsty man two or three drops of water, these two or three drops cannot extinguish his thirst; therefore, it is necessary to give more to extinguish his thirst. So, two or three reforms to the people availed nothing; but after enjoying the first reforms, the people crave others. The Pope never granted any reform to his own disadvantage. The Pope said to Father Ventura, I cannot concede any more reforms, which attack my own power, because I swore to maintain and to transmit unimpaired to my successor, my spiritual and temporal power, as I received it from my predecessors—thus the liberties of Italy were lost, if the Pope was obliged by the people to grant a constitution with a responsible ministry, that is the shadow of a constitution; and, therefore, all our reforms came short of the just wishes of the people. But, Pius did not grant the constitution and reform as was necessary for his subjects, but he persecuted his subjects who worked for the sake of liberty. Oh! my dear brethren, then we thought very coldly of Pius, and we said, he is a priest. He styled himself the Vicar of Christ; but this Vicar of Christ condemned to be shot one hundred and fifty innocent Roman subjects, who had been imprisoned for four years, implicated in some charges pertaining to the revolution of '48 and '49.

Americans, if in your country any one becomes criminal, and acts against American liberty, you condemn him. After a few months of imprisonment, you give him a public trial; but after four years and a half of imprisonment, without any kind of trial, to see a hundred and fifty men shot by order of the Priest of Rome, called the Vicar of Christ, is a horrible spectacle—is a disgrace to Christendom. Another instance of the cruelty of this man, and called till to-day, even by some Protestants, an angel of peace, and a good-hearted man, and a liberal Pope. My poor

companion, Ugo Bassi, my dear Ugo Bassi, who was young, handsome, endowed by God with talents and estimable gifts—a great scholar, knowing Greek, Latin, Hebrew, French—instructed in all fine arts, playing on three or four instruments, a connoisseur of pictures, excelling as an orator, without rival in the eloquence of the pulpit, one of the finest poets among the Italians, an ardent patriot, without bigotry, without superstition, of the severest morality in the habits of his life; my dear companion, my own friend, Ugo Bassi, who was with me, and who preached the Italian crusade; who was taken prisoner, who was wounded on the field of battle, who was especially with the glorious legion of Garibaldi: Ugo Bassi, so kind, so young, so talented, so dear to all Italians, was shot, by order of Pius IX., in his native City of Bologna, where his mother was living. Before he was shot, he was degraded from the priesthood—the skin of his scalp and hands was gashed by the inquisitors, and in the morning, on the very spot where he had preached the liberty of Italy—amidst the tears of the Austrian soldiers who were commanded to shoot him, he fell, by seven bullets, crying, with expiring love—“Long live the Church of Christ, and Italy.” Such is Pius IX. with the Italians, with priests and monks. Oh! my dear Americans, remember not to confide yourselves to this Pope.

Hear my last words. If Pius IX. has done nothing for Italy, so Pius IX. will never do any good for America, to which he is a stranger. Remember that God is just; that God no doubt has permitted the appearance of Pius and his apparent reforms for two objects—first, to bring all people together in the true spirit of Christianity; or, in other words, when Pius appeared as a reformed Pope, England, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, New Grenada, Mexico, Brazil, America, Greece, Turkey, all went to Rome to do homage to the Pope, by means of messengers and ambassadors, to congratulate him as the first popular ruler, and the first who granted an amnesty. So that in a few years, if Pius IX. had been faithful to his first reforms, my dear brethren, the great majority among the Protestants would have become Romanists. The other object of his appearance is, that

Pius IX. might produce in Italy a sense of Italian nationality. As in the first instance he has proved possible the universal fraternity among Christians, and among every nationality of men; in the second instance, Pius has proved possible the unity of the Italian provinces, in order to obtain independence and nationality. Therefore, by the first appearance of Pius IX. we have two good things—namely, we have now the first indication that it is possible to obtain a universal brotherhood among Christians, not under Popes, but under Christ; secondly, that it is possible to obtain union among Italians, not under Popes, but under the tri-colored flag of the republic.

Now, therefore, do not allow yourselves to feel grieved that Pius IX. was not faithful. That is my conclusion. Thank God, Christian America, for Pius IX. Thank God for Pius's apostasy to liberty.

If Pius had been faithful to his first reforms, at present, no doubt, I should be a fervent Papist, and no Papists would be thinking of abandoning this system, and about crushing this Papal impostor. We thank God for the political apostasy of Pius IX., because to-day it is possible to speak against his temporal and spiritual power.

We thank God that to-day the Italians are no longer deluded on this subject; to-day the Italians know better than before the great truth spoken by Machiavelli—"While the Pope remains in Rome, Italy cannot be free." I repeat what I said in another lecture, "We desire to have an independent Italy, we wish to obtain the freedom and independence of Italy; but because Pope and Popery are the greatest enemies of independent Italy, we swear upon the altar of our native Italy, we swear before God and the Christian world, to overthrow, to destroy, to annihilate Popery and the Pope in Italy!"

LECTURE IX.

THE INQUISITION AND THE MADIAI.

My subject this evening is the Inquisition of Rome and the Madiai. I shall prove that the Inquisition is the father of crime and cruelty, and then I shall speak briefly upon the Inquisition as it existed in Rome in 1849; and, finally, upon one of the most celebrated trials of Italy, that of the Madiai.

Over princes, kings, and emperors, was the power of the Inquisition. Over all but the affiliated of that tribunal, against whom, to make a trial, it was necessary to obtain a special license from Rome or from the High Inquisitors; so that from the beginning until to-day all Popes have granted privileges to the inquisition and to the inquisitors. We have not less than twenty-four bulls, which conferred the last degree of power upon the inquisitors; and they have subjected to the control of the Inquisition, by means of these bulls, even Mahomedans, Jews, and Turks, as well as Protestants, not only when they live in ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but even when removed from it, in their native country. It is stated that every dogma is under the control of the inquisitors; for instance, even that of the Jews; so that, examining seriously the bulls of the Pope with regard to the Inquisition, you can only conclude that the Popish system will not tolerate any other. They would rather people were infidels than Christians, without the pale of their church. And in order to maintain this power the Inquisition solicited the pro-

tection of princes and rulers. It is true, as I stated before, that all these potentates were under the control of the inquisitors. You know that the inquisitors were always very wary and prudent in dealing with these high personages; but when they had to do with the poor people, and people of the middle classes, especially when there was money to be obtained, they were very severe, especially in Spain, where the Inquisition was so very severe, whose kings, though guilty of every immorality, they never presumed to attack. We have the most Christian king of France, with seven mistresses, but the Inquisition had nothing to do with that; so that Louis XIV., surrounded by a legion of illegitimate children, was still a great king of France. Why? Because he revoked the Edict of Nantes, thus committing to exile the Huguenots of his kingdom. This one act obliterated a multitude of sins.

So was it that the Inquisition dealt with princes and rulers. If not blind to their faults, it was at least tolerant, and in return for this tolerance, kings and princes everywhere protected the authority of the Inquisition, and left unpunished all the atrocities committed, so as to be aided themselves by the Inquisition in their political cruelties—so that it became an association of rapine, despotism, and cruelty. If you will aid my politics, I, king, will sanction your cruelties. In this way was Christianity made the victim of this power, supported by an army of ruffians, called in Spanish the *San Hermarudad*, being really an attack on her freedom and purity, and under pretence of the honor and glory of Christ.

In order to have a just idea of such an army of inquisitors, I can say something about its organization in Italy in the reign of Gregory XVI., and it is no better to-day.

We were so dreadfully oppressed, especially by the police, that in order to escape their surveillance, many asked, as a particular favor, to form a portion of it, by becoming spies and emissaries of the Inquisition. You, in America, will hesitate to believe this, because you enjoy both civil and religious liberty; but if you put yourself into the condition of my Italians, twenty years ago—not now, because no true Italian to-day will serve the Inquisi-

tion—we prefer death to being sbirri or servants of the Inquisition. But twenty years ago, before the last struggle of Italy, we, with the great majority of the Italians, were also blind.

Twenty years ago in Perugia, a town of twenty thousand inhabitants, in a province of sixty thousand, the Inquisition numbered not less than five thousand emissaries and ruffians. This was in Perugia, where I lived nearly two years. And in order to explain such a coil, you must remember that these people were driven into it by the oppression of the civil police. Why? because when a man was an affiliated of the Inquisition, and was its obedient servant, he obtained a card of free circulation, and by means of this permit he could carry arms, and was not watched by the gens d'armes, nor by the police.

Thus, to escape the tyranny of the police, many even among the aristocracy became sbirri or servants of the Inquisition; and so did it increase its influence over society. And in order to give you an idea of this tribunal, in this particular business, I will now speak more especially of its nature.

Trials in this tribunal were always against right and justice. Justice cannot be rightly administered without publicity. If you have secret trials, secret tribunals, and secret combinations, you will never be certain that justice is properly administered; and, therefore, in your America, as I find in England also, you are happy, because all is public in the administration of justice. Not only that, but you have a trial by jury, the guarantee of justice to the accused, and by which your judges are controlled, and have little to do but to confirm the sentence of the jury, applying to it the letter of the law in each particular case; therefore the administration of justice must be right. This is not the case in the tribunal of the holy office, because it is in the power of all (by bribery and other means) to put into prison innocent victims. When an accusation is brought, the very accuser himself can be a witness; therefore the accuser and witness are one and the same person. Witnesses are never confronted with the accused. Witnesses have to swear never to divulge anything beyond the precincts of the Inquisition, and the inquisitors never betray him. No jury, no freedom of defence, for the defence

allowed is but a shadow—a barrister being appointed by the Inquisition itself. The trial is secret—or the sentence without trial equally secret—so that in the greater number of instances we may suppose, nay, be certain, that sentences were unjust, because the judges were all parties interested in condemnation. The judges were monks, generally speaking, ignorant men, especially in all civil matters; acquainted with nothing but theology; cruel by profession, because it is stated in the code of the Inquisition that the judge must show himself so in face, words, and deeds. Then they also were rendered cruel by education, Romanism leading to sternness and cruelty, the few benevolent and charitable in that creed being but exceptions. Holy and charitable men among Roman Catholic priests are few; therefore the greatest part of the priests are priests of the devil!

The judges in free countries, such as here and in England, are not necessarily severe in aspect, but merciful, and predisposed to leniency towards the criminal. Why are they so? Because, generally speaking, they are husbands, fathers, and citizens; they have social and domestic affections, and so can feel for others. Now, among the inquisitors we have nothing of this sort, because they belong to the Roman Catholic clergy, who profess celibacy; therefore they are without affection. When a man is neither a husband nor a father; when by his sectarian profession a man is no longer a citizen, we must conclude that he becomes a cruel man. He vents his rage against the world, and thus are most priests cruel. It is for them a matter of rejoicing, when they have condemned any to torture and death.

We have instances in Italy, especially in Sicily, of this fact. During the executions, the inquisitors will often chant "*Te Deum*." In Seville, during the execution of more than three hundred criminals, they chanted the "*Te Deum*" with music, and afterwards dined with the authorities—drinking and making merry over the ashes of their victims—and they considered the *auto-da-fe*, at which thousands were burned, a great festival in honor of Christ.

This is the organization of the Inquisition. Now, in England, it was whispered to me, "but, Father, you speak against celi-

bacy." "Yes, because celibacy is the source of immorality;" but this I have no time to develop to-night. You, in America, are fully aware of the morality of the Roman Catholic priesthood, in their communications with their most holy, spiritual daughters. But I will not enlarge on this subject now; at least, no further than to support my proposition, that celibacy is the cause of cruelty! Many will think that I speak against the celibacy of the priesthood, because those priests who have joined Protestantism have often done so in order to marry rich wives.

My dear brethren, if many have abandoned the Church of Rome to marry, in my case there will be an exception. No, I am not going to seek the companionship of a beautiful and affectionate woman, either American or English. The wife of my bosom, to whom I have dedicated my life, my heart, the energies of my mind, the affections of my soul—is my country, my dear, my beloved Italy! To her I shall be ever faithful; for her I shall live, for her I shall die, that I may free her from all tyrannies—from Pope and Popery.

In order to extort or obtain confessions from the accused, they employ jesuitical men. One of the first directions is—and I quote from leading works—"When the victim is presented to the tribunal the inquisitor must have in his hand a paper; he shall look all the time on this paper, whilst saying to the culprit, you are guilty—I know your crimes, you had better confess them, and you will obtain mercy." The prisoner supposes that on this paper the crime is really recorded. It is said in the book that the paper must be black, without any trace of writing. Then they conduct the accused before a crucifix, before which two lights are burning. Supposing the inquisitors really to know something of his life, he perhaps confesses having committed some crime. For, if a man should make a spontaneous confession before fifteen days from the time of his imprisonment, he is promised some indulgence. What do you suppose he obtains? Why, to be strangled or burned alive, instead of some bloody death; so that he has actually been made to confess a crime hitherto unknown to the inquisitors, who, taking advantage of the confession, conclude the trial and condemn the criminal.

Another device to obtain confession was, to put the criminal in prison, and after a few days send to him one of his friends. This friend says, "Fear nothing, no harm will come to you; I, too, was imprisoned—they were very kind to me. I confessed, and was acquitted and set free." The criminal usually believes this apparent friend, and he is treated with dinners and wine, of which he partakes with his friend; and often, after one of these repasts, he will say, "I did dishonor the worship of the Virgin Mary," or "I did deny the real presence," etc., etc. After this confession the door of the prison suddenly opens, and an inquisitor, who had been always silently watching, listening, and peeping, rushes in. Now, says he, you have confessed, come with me into the chamber of the Inquisition and repeat what you said here, for that alone will suffice for your expiation. And he usually goes there and confesses in presence of others. Now, having obtained all this from their victims, they are sentenced, and few out of the thousands who are condemned ever escape with their lives, and those who do, endure five or ten years of close imprisonment—a term which none ever reach. The usual punishment is death, or the galleys for life.

What, now, was the condemnation to death? There were two ways of execution; one secret, the other public. The Church of Rome says, that it never did, nor ever will, spill human blood. Before coming to the torture, of which many died, the Father Inquisitors invoke three times the blessed name of Jesus Christ, and say—If, during torture, any of your members are burned or broken, it is not the Inquisition, but you yourself who do it. And this is nothing but a jesuitical, mental reservation.

As to the Church not spilling blood, the Inquisition never shed human blood, because the Inquisition condemns to two kinds of deaths—namely, strangling and burning; so that without shedding blood, it was really the executioner of many, many thousands of people.

Now, in order to have an idea of the secret death, I can tell you of people burned in some dark dungeon. This, however, was nothing compared with the other torture by water. The

victim was made to sit down on a hard stone in the middle of the prison, with his arms bound behind him; on his face was placed an iron mask, which was opened but once or twice a day, when a Dominican friar went to give the victim bread and water, his daily food. Over his head continually dropped one drop of water, and this drop, from his being bound in one position, always fell on the same spot; after a few days the hair was worn away, the skin was macerated. Week after week, sometimes year after year, this drop continued to fall, till his skull was perforated, and then the first drop reaching the brain, was the merciful drop which terminated the sufferings of this poor victim. Such was one of the private executions, decreed by these men for the glory of Christ.

The public, doubtless, is well informed on the subject of the *auto-da-fe*, where, on piles of faggots, a dozen victims or sometimes a hundred, are consumed. In order to conceive an idea of the charity of these priests, in several States, as late as 1822, there were visible large furnaces, capable of burning at once not less than three hundred human beings; and it was, I repeat, the occasion of a great festival among the inquisitors. The victims, had paper mitres on their heads, and their bodies covered with robes upon which flames and devils were painted. When they approached the fatal pile, the last words of the inquisitors to the executioner were, "be kind to them, and spare their blood!" In a few minutes more, they were ashes—and their remains were dispersed over the fields, or cast into the sea.

In the face of these cruelties, the Romanists call themselves Christians! true worshippers of Christ! followers of the true Church! the servants of the true Gospel! You! your Church is the prison of the Inquisition; your Gospel is the torture; your Christ is its executioner. But, many people are in the habit of saying, lecturers are opposed to the Roman Catholics, founding their objections upon the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisitions; while, as they allege, the people at large are not aware that the Spanish Inquisition was a lay tribunal. I have already answered, that the Spanish Inquisition was an ecclesiastical tribunal, supported exclusively by monks and prelates. Now, I say, if

you think to excuse your Church, because these atrocities were only perpetrated in the Spanish Inquisition, you mistake. You say that the Inquisition in Rome was but a mere tribunal to prevent and punish crimes that were committed by the priests, and certain capital offences among the Italians; and that no severe sentences of imprisonment or death ever passed the Inquisition at Rome. In Italy we have a proverb, that the career of a lie is short: therefore, this Roman falsehood was laid naked before the people at the time of our Roman republic. Keep in mind, my dear brethren, what I have said—that the Inquisition owed its very existence to the Church of Rome. He who is called in that Church, the Vicar of Christ, is the chief prefect, and governor-general of the inquisitors—the inquisitor of inquisitors: and the Church of Rome supported the atrocities and iniquities perpetrated by the Inquisition. But, we liberals, we patriots, when we governed Rome, exposed the deeds of the Inquisition. We opened its chambers to the world; we, Christians, though sometimes called infidels and atheists, disclosed its enormities, and delivered the victims of these priests of Rome. Now, what did we find in the Inquisition? If you read a work on my country, which just occurs to me, and which I recommend, not for the author, but for the subject; if you would know what Italy is, and Popery, you will have a good account of all these subjects as well as of the Inquisition. It is the work of Mr. Dwight. Now, before I saw this work, I was myself in the Inquisition, and I compared this work with my own experience and knowledge, and I found that the truth had reached the Americans.

To speak half the truth belongs to the Roman Catholic priest and the Roman Catholic newspapers. Now, when the doors of the Inquisition were opened in Rome, I was the first to enter; and I was nearly in the same dress as the one I have now on, being the dress of first chaplain to our military crusade. People laughed at seeing me in the Inquisition, and said, you only of all the priests dare put your feet in this building; for if any other should dare to come here to inspect the Inquisition, he would be forced to remain here for ever; so terribly were the Roman

people excited at the sight of the Inquisition, so dreadful were its atrocities, so great had been the number of its victims.

What did we find. The first discovery was an apartment, containing fine furniture and works of art—these were the apartments of the inquisitors; so that on first entering, you would exclaim, oh! it is not so horrible as people say. But, go on into the second court-yard, and you will find among other prisons a little room, in which we discovered an oven. In this prison were also some female dresses, some dresses of nuns, some of little children. Here, exclaimed some people, is a furnace, an oven; and here, too, we found dresses of women and children. All is mystery. But, what are we to conclude? There are the dresses—there had been the victims, women and babies—perhaps the victims of some Romish priest there paid for listening to priestly seduction—that was the first step in the Roman Inquisition. After this, we came to a large and elegant chamber; this chamber is called the chamber of the second father companion. The first father companion is the Pope's vicar-general, who has also a very spacious apartment. In this large chamber, that of the second father companion, was the confessional, where the victim was made to confess to the father companion, and afterwards the second companion received the auricular confession—having given absolution by means of the sacrament, he said kindly to him—Go in peace, and may God be with you. Go to the father inquisitor to receive your dress. The victim, full of hope, blesses the worthy friar, kisses his hand, and proceeds to the room of the first inquisitor. When he gets into the passage which divides the rooms, he stepped upon a trap, and was precipitated a distance of seventy feet; and it was not freedom into this life again, but freedom into everlasting life in Christ. In this abyss we found much human hair mixed with water, smelling of mortality; no bones, nothing but hair and ashes, macerated by time and age.

Our third discovery was more difficult. On a small step we found a basket filled with bottles; underneath, through a trap, we found a place called the prison of Pius V., used as caves for

wild beasts. In one of these caves, we found some dozens of skeletons; they were all in a vertical position; they were buried in lime, and were without heads, and all the skulls were piled up in a little mound in a corner. These were the victims of another kind of torture.

The victims were put into a species of bath of fresh lime, so that they were slowly consumed, the lime reaching up to the head; so that, by the time the lime was dry, they had expired in great torture. After one year, the heads, detached from the neck, were placed, not thrown, in nice symmetrical order in a corner; so, literally these people had been burned alive. Such was the Inquisition at Rome, and this is in the palace of the Pope, called the Vatican. Here the Pope walks in his gardens, enjoys his table, drinks his champagne as Gregory XVI. did, even to drunkenness. Here he enjoys himself with music and society; whilst close by, many victims are, by his order, condemned to torture and death, or to imprisonment for life, without light or the common necessities of life. In many instances, despair and sorrow produced death. Such was the Inquisition in Rome. Thank God, in the short period of the Roman republic, we discovered these iniquities, and prevented there being any more victims. The very first act of the Pontiff, on his return, was to restore the Inquisition in Rome, to glorify Christ. Now, if the Inquisition is such as we know it to be, our conclusion may be, that if the Church of Rome, in order to preach, inculcate, and maintain her theories, her doctrines, her practices, needs always the Inquisition, she is no more the Church of Christ, which was preached and supported by mercy, charity, and peace, without violence, without persecution. But here is the Church of the anti-Christ, preached and supported by butchery and blood. Now, among other enormities perpetrated since the re-establishment of the Inquisition, is certainly the trial of the Madiat.

Many suppose that this does not concern the Inquisition; but it is necessary you should know, that out of the Roman States, the Inquisition is administered by laymen, that is, by the police, and the tyrannical Jesuits of our Italian despots. The

Church of Rome obtains a revenue by persecuting the Protestants, as I could easily establish by numerous instances, especially a recent one, (the Madiai) in which she was aided by the Grand Duke of Tuscany.

In speaking of this trial, we have two things to consider—namely, the trial itself, and then what was said about it, especially in the letter of Archbishop Hughes. Now, what was the trial; it was very long, but I shall be brief. It was stated in all Protestant countries that the Madiai were condemned for no other crime than that of having in their possession the Bible, of having read it, and circulated it. Now, this is what I will tell you, Until lately, I have had nothing definite about this; and, as I never speak of anything I do not know, I refrained from saying anything till I got it from a pure source, very difficult to obtain at this great distance. This paper I hold is the Gazette of the Tribunal of Florence.

I shall read extracts to show, first, what was the sentence; second, what was the foundation of the trial; and, finally, consider whether they had violated the laws of Tuscany. Now, the sentence was pronounced on this ground. [The Father here recapitulated the leading facts and arguments of this celebrated trial, which we do not repeat here.]

Thus, then, the sentence of the Court of Florence was given on the charge of impiety, which means making proselytes to the pure Gospel of Christ. Now, Dr. Kyle, and Mr. Lucas, in Ireland, maintain that the Madiai were guilty of violating the Tuscan law. Not only the recent constitutional law of 1847, but of violating the Leopoldine law. It is quoted by the royal prosecutor from the sixteenth Article of the Penal Code of Tuscany. [The Father then continued, and concluded his synopsis of the case.]

Now, let us see whether they were guilty of a violation of this Tuscan law. The public prosecutor, a jesuitical bad man, maintained that the Madiai had violated all laws, but especially they were guilty of teaching maxims opposed to "our holy religion;" and in support of his argument, he cited two documents, the first of which says it is necessary to have three witnesses present

when they teach ; therefore, without there being three witnesses present you have no publicity whatever. We cannot now quote the trial, but from that it is certain that Rosa Madiat attempted to convert a young girl, and also entertained with another young woman discourses against the Roman Catholics. Therefore, Rosa never had three persons assembled together. She was accused of having conversed with them on religion, but even if she did, the crime did not exist, because there were not three together. It was a private conversation, not a public teaching ; therefore, the laws could not punish the Madiat.

The same view may be taken of Francis Madiat. He gave no public teachings at all, but spoke on religious matters with some friends, and that during the trial. So that this could not be brought in the trial as evidence against having assailed the religion dominant in Tuscany.

It is true that in the house of the Madiat there sometimes met together, eighteen, twenty, or even thirty persons ; but it is also stated that they did not meet together to be converted ; they were already Protestants, and came to be confirmed in their Protestant principles. Therefore, Francis and Rosa Madiat, though they gave freely the use of their house for such a meeting, did not at all seek to make conversions ; they merely afforded the Protestants opportunities of meeting. Therefore, I can state from this platform, and I publish it in order to give the lie to the Roman Catholics, I say, I can state that the crime of the two Madiat was a charge of impiety in converting, but the trial does not prove that they ever attempted it, and yet the court condemned them to four years of solitary confinement and hard labor.

But, now, the other prosecutor came to another conclusion, and when the cause came to the Court of Appeals, he concluded with these words, that he could not agree with the first sentence, because, even if they had in their room people who had met with a Protestant view, they could not be punished by imprisonment, because there was no publicity of their religious doctrines.

Therefore, my dear brethren, where is the crime of impiety,

attributed to the Madiai? When proselytism was imputed to the Madiai, where is the crime, where the proselytes? What is the first observation of the reporters of the Madiai case?

The cause was conducted with closed doors, and, in Tuscany, under the constitutional regimen, the last light of its liberties was extinguished, when this trial was conducted with closed doors, for when all others were discussed publicly, this one was discussed with closed doors.

The reporters were wrong. We think the people of Tuscany would draw light for their country from this proceeding. I have now proved that they sought not to make proselytes; and I shall prove their innocence of the other charges.

A poor nun, said to be one of their proselytes, sent a note, in which she stated, under oath, that she was never converted by Rosa Madiai, as was said in the trial. Since this failed, the Madiai were accused of having read the Bible. That was true. But the ground of the sentence was, that they taught the real religion of Christ, trying to make converts. I now ask Mr. Lucas of Ireland, who said the Tuscan government justly and rightly condemned the Madiai for seeking to make proselytes (which, however, they never did), it being forbidden in Catholic countries for Protestantism to make proselytes, why the Catholics in Protestant countries should be allowed to make converts? If you have that right, we surely have it too. It is a duty of conscience, when a man knows the truth, to diffuse it around him. A man is guilty before God and society, if, knowing the truth, he conceals it through fear.

Peter, who was no Jesuit, was no Pius IX., said, I obey God before I obey man; therefore, if the Madiai privately, in their own house, with some friends, secretly spread the Word of God, they did their duty to God and Christ. My dear brethren, they were betrayed by spies in their own houses, because they privately taught to disbelieve the Virgin Mary, purgatory, and transubstantiation. Oh! Madiai, you did your duty when you despised these doctrines, and God will bless you. It is a piece of stupid presumption of the Romanists to prevent proselytism amongst good and true Christians. The Papists, whose nature it

is to make proselytes, who cannot live without it, who make conversion in season and out of season, as Paul did; who, in order to have proselytes, seek them in the houses of Protestant America, who entreat ladies to go to the confessional and to mass, who disturb families with their importunities—these same Papists dare to accuse us of spreading the Word of God, and of making proselytes!

Now, if from the trial of the Madiat we can learn anything, it will be a great blessing. Why were the Roman Catholics so severe against the Madiat in Italy? Because it was the first case of open Protestantism that had occurred there; so the Papist system in Italy thought necessary to stop it at the outset, in order to prevent the whole of Italy from becoming Protestant. They were severe against the Madiat, in order to frighten the Italians from becoming Protestant Christians. It is a lesson for you, my dear brethren, which I hope will teach you to prevent, in the beginning, the devil from entering your country. But if, as in my own dear Italy, the Papists in America dare attempt to crush Protestantism, and if Protestants permit Protestantism to be strangled, to what power may we look for protection? Now, mark—I have the original documents of the life and trial of the Madiat, and it is best for the Romanists to be silent. In this respect, the course of the good Archbishop John, of New York, is worthy of all approval. What is John of New York? I don't know: I suppose he is John from Ireland. Now, John—John with a cross—this man said, with great apparent honesty, that he could not condemn the Madiat because he had no documents, because he was not in possession of the laws relating to the case. I approve the honesty and prudence of the Archbishop, in not going on to say what Doctor Kyle said—and you know what a liar this Doctor Kyle is. But let us examine this beautiful John of the Cross. But this is the best specimen of policy, to say nothing about the matter; and to give utterance to his secret rage does not amount to much against the Madiat. This is what, in Italy, we call whipping the harness when you cannot whip the horse. This is now the feeling of cross John.

I have now something to say about his letter. In this letter he sneers at American philanthropy; our philanthropy was really imitated from the philanthropy of England; and so he laughed at the philanthropy of England and America.

This is good, because we know that cross John, of New York, don't belong to any philanthropic societies. But they dared to call the Church of Rome a very benevolent church, very philanthropic and very charitable, and to laugh at the philanthropy of England and America, when America desired to sympathize with two poor victims in their prison. It is true that the Roman Catholic church is a very philanthropic one; but her philanthropies are penances imposed upon young girls—are auricular confessions—are fastings, abstinences, and macerations. Her philanthropy in the other world is purgatory, in this world, the Inquisition; and, therefore, John of New York may laugh at the philanthropy of American Protestants, because it is really different from the philanthropy of the Inquisition of the Pope.

Now this man said something about the aristocracy of America trying to import into America a sympathy for the Madiai, from the aristocracy of England. Don't speak about aristocracy, my dear John, because I know the Roman Catholic feeling in Italy, and the jesuit feeling, at the head of which you stand, in New York. The Jesuits flatter the aristocracy in Europe, but here John flatters the democracy, for here democracy is the leading power—so that they arrange matters according to circumstances. Yes, my dear brethren, when you, Americans, import the English sympathy for the Madiai, you have surely a greater right to do so than when John imports the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the Sisters of Mercy, and the Sisters of Charity. The chief rage of this holy mitred man is against the meeting in Metropolitan Hall.

This man blamed the meeting in Metropolitan Hall, and according to the jesuitical feeling he tried to cast ignominy upon some of your leading American people who signed the call of this meeting. Remember that you are a Roman Catholic priest, oh, John! a very charitable Roman Catholic bishop. Whenever he

speaks against Protestants suspect his words, because he does not speak the truth, but merely tries to bring discredit upon the Protestant cause.

Now let me give you a little advice, dear Archbishop John. Why do you sneer at the meeting at Metropolitan Hall to sympathize with the Madiat? The Roman Catholics of America are not to be made responsible for the treatment of the Madiat in Italy. You said that the call of this meeting was a bad thing; that it was calculated to excite Protestants against Roman Catholics; to revive the Protestant crusade against Romanists.

The American Catholics may have had nothing to do with the trial of the Madiat; but, surely, the American Christians may sympathize with them for all that, without making the Roman Catholics in America accomplices of the Roman Catholics in Italy. But, my dear John of the cross, when you accuse Protestants of meeting together to sympathize with the Madiat, you should be more logical, my dear John.

If you find fault with this meeting, you can never allow any meeting for Roman Catholic affairs or sympathies.

But, my dear John, a few weeks after this circumstance, you, who are everywhere, and everywhere announced as preaching everywhere, you call a meeting of sympathy for the Archbishop of Bogota. This is the consistency of John Cross of New York; my dear brethren, for the express purpose of sympathizing with the Archbishop, for the purpose of presenting a gift to the Archbishop, for the purpose of sympathizing with the Catholics of New Grenada. And now, mark you, when the American Protestants sympathized with the poor Madiat, they sympathized with two poor victims of the Church of Rome. But when the Roman Catholic church sympathized with the Archbishop of Bogota, they sympathized with the arch agitator of New Grenada; whose government has the right to take away from the Church of Rome the nomination of the parish priests; a right which, from the earliest times of Christianity, belonged to the people.

Now, my dear brethren, New Grenada has had to pay for her stupidity and bigotry in remaining exclusively a Roman Ca-

tholic country. New Grenada now knows that the Popish system and a republican government are antagonists, and that a president of a republic and a nuncio of the Pope cannot agree.

All Central America is in the same condition. How miserable is now the condition of Roman Catholic Mexico, with her nuncio and concordat? How miserable the condition of New Grenada! and how miserable also will be the condition of the United States, if they do not guard against a similar result!

Finally, John of York reproaches the American Protestants for not importing also from England the system of ragged schools. Now, the only people here who need ragged schools are the Irish—not because they are Irish, but because they are Roman Catholics—for even in their native home the ragged boys do not belong to the Protestants, but to the Roman Catholics.

The Protestants in England have done well in educating the ragged boys. Not only does she pay for the education of Irish boys, but she also pays for the education of Irish men, at the college of Maynooth, to which she gives thirty thousand pounds annually, and this in order to educate and support the Roman Catholic priests; and yet these very same priests keep the Irish people in slavish ignorance. Therefore, I say it would be useless to have the ragged school in America for natives, but it would be good for Roman Catholic Irishmen.

At last the Archbishop dares to say, that the Bible is not forbidden among Roman Catholics, and that the Madiai were not condemned for having read it; notwithstanding that the first prosecutor, on the trial, charged as one of their crimes this actual fact of the reading of the Bible. But, John of New York dares to say that in Italy, before the translation of the Bible by Luther, there did actually exist a pure and correct translation, and that Pius VI. approved of it. Oh! Jesuit priest! Before the translation of Martin Luther we had really a Bible, but the Council of Trent forbade the reading of this translation, though they approved of the translation itself. Of what use, therefore, was it? Pius, as a scholar, eulogized this translation, but, as Pope, he forbade its being read without Papal notes and commentaries, or without the Latin text in the margin; and

Pius VII., in one of his bulls, forbade the translation of Martini, the Archbishop of Florence. Thus is it that the Papists speak only half the truth, in order to deceive the American Catholics.

Now, God only is just and infallible; and, therefore, I hope in the Word of God, in the Word of Christ, that all the rage of this man is to redound to the manifestation of the truth concerning the Scriptures. You, John, try to make the Protestants believe that the Bible is read among Catholics; it is not true; the Romanists are prevented from reading the Word of God; and, therefore, do not mistake the mission of the Papists in your country.

Protestants, the mission of this man, and of all missions in your country, is to prevent Protestants from reading the Word of God!

Take heed of your Bible, watch it well; remember that America will be lost when she loses her Bible.

LECTURE X.

THE PRESENT WAR OF POPERY AGAINST PROTESTANTISM.

My subject this evening is, the present War of Popery against Protestantism. I begin by the War against Protestantism, made directly by men of the Roman Catholic faith. In the latter part of the lecture, I shall prove this by means of Protestant allies. That Popery is always at war against Protestantism, is a general proposition which doesn't require any proof. History is at hand to prove this proposition; and, therefore, I proceed to speak of the *present* war against Protestantism, because it should be always present to the minds of Protestants, that Popery never changes; and while she remains Popery, this war must continue. Because to-day in Rome it is a simple proposition, that either Popery must come down, or the Gospel cannot triumph. But, if a Pope, as Pope, must live by means of Popery, then Popes must continue the war against the Gospel professed by Protestants; so that this war will always be going on while Popery exists. In the present day, I shall prove my proposition by the eagerness of the Roman Catholic Church to convert, as if they were blind heretics, the perfect Protestants of England and America. In Rome, we have a festival annually, for the purpose of praying to God for the conversion to Popery of all mankind. In Florence and Lucca, and many other places in Italy, the Virgin Mary is implored to convert heretics throughout the world, especially in England and America. In France, among those very Christian people of France—the holy country-

men of the holy Voltaire, and the holy Diderot—there was instituted some years ago, a congregation entitled the Sacred Heart of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, for the conversion of all Protestants, especially in England, and those also in your very perfect and heretical country. So that all Papists, you see, are employed and founded for your conversion. You are the children of the devil, and it is now the care of the Roman Catholic Church to try to save you from hell and the devil.

You ought, then, to be very grateful to the Pope and Popery.

Now, Protestants are sometimes very hard to convert; the Protestant faith, is a rugged faith; and, therefore, it is necessary in order to facilitate the conversion of Protestants, to have a few miracles at hand; for, according to St. Paul, miracles are for unbelievers. Therefore, not only in the present century, but in this present year, and in the last year, we have had miracles performed in Italy for the conversion of Protestants. It is said, in the papers at Naples, that God, in order to confound the obstinacy of heretics, had thought fit to perform miracles in two towns of Italy—namely, Barri and Andrea. You will remember, in my lecture on relics, what I said about the thorns in the crown of Christ. Now, in order to confirm my assertion, that they are but common thorns, I read in a late European newspaper, that two thorns of the crown of Christ, encountered in a species of duel, fighting with each other, as to who should perform the best miracle before the Neapolitans.

But what was the object of the miracle, you will ask? Why, for your benefit, Americans; for the blind Protestants; for stony-hearted heretics.

In Barri is worshipped a thorn of the crown of Christ, on Good Friday. One 25th of March (this thorn of Barri for centuries had dropped blood)—this year Good Friday fell on the 25th of March—the people, bishops, magistrates, captains of police, officers of the army, in short, the whole population were assembled before the thorn of Christ, and, *mirabile dictu!* in the presence of all, the thorn of Christ distilled some dozen drops of clear and fresh blood, supposed to be the blood of our Divine Saviour; and all the assembled people responded by tears, touched by such a

miracle. But the nearest town, called Andrea, had a thorn of the crown of Christ, as well as the town of Barri; and, in presence of the bishops and the whole town, including the wise governor, this second thorn distilled likewise some drops of our Divine Saviour's blood, of course. So that in Italy you see the rivalry between the thorns of the crown of Christ. One thorn cannot perform a miracle without exciting a miracle in a neighboring thorn, so that people distill all the blood of Christ through these thorns.

In all this is to be seen the hand of God. There is his hand ever ready to confound atheism and infidelity; and, in order to confound the Protestant heretics, and convince the world that the Church of Christ is the Popish Church.

Do you know what all this means? Is it not an extraordinary thing to have a thorn distilling fresh blood. Now, I desire to ask the Neapolitans who believe in this miracle, and I desire to ask all Roman Catholics to whom can this blood belong. Is it the identical blood of Christ; if so, what Christ? The Christ of the Christians, or the Christ of the Papists; a Christ in heaven, or a Christ on earth. As I proved in another lecture, about the milk of the Virgin Mary, Christ in heaven cannot shed blood at all, because he cannot from his glorified body lose anything. His blood could only be drawn from a wound, and a wound cannot be given without suffering. Now, the glorified Christ cannot suffer; therefore, cannot be wounded.

The glorified body of Christ cannot shed blood; therefore, this cannot be the blood of Christ.

Nor is it the original blood which flowed from Christ in the pretorium of Pilate. And then, again, were these thorns really and certainly those of the crown of Christ? Did these thorns touch the flesh of Christ? Were they imbued with his blood?

After the resurrection of Christ, when he took away his body, did any part of the blood of Christ remain in these thorns?

If you suppose these thorns to have been imbued with one drop of the real blood of Christ, can they now distill, every ten years, dozens and dozens of drops of this same blood of Christ? Is this, then, the blood of Christ? No. What is it then?

Well, it is one of the usual impostures of the Church of Rome!

My dear brethren, the true thorn in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church, is the Protestant faith; and, in order to take it out of her sight, the Popish Church produces the thorns from the crown of Christ.

Now, we have many fine artists in Italy, men skilled in the very minutest handicrafts; and, with their assistance, it is so easy to make a thorn, and to give it miraculous powers? Have you never seen wizards or magicians, who perform most wonderful acts by means of machinery and manual dexterity. So these thorns are filled with fictitious blood; and thus the people, who believe implicitly in their priests, believe that these thorns were actually the thorns of the crown of Christ; though, in reality, they have been prepared but a few days before by a skilful workman, and filled with chemical blood, and made to work a chemical miracle. So it is that in Andrea now flows the blood of Christ to the confusion of heretics, and to confirm the Catholics in their devotion and adhesion to the Popish Church.

My dear brethren, if you remain obstinate after such astounding miracles, it is a sign that the hand of God no longer protects you. Be comforted by the Roman Catholics, be converted to their art and faith, and to Pope and Popery, in view of such a miraculous miracle performed by the thorns and blood of Christ! No, my dear brethren, this is an illustration of the moral and spiritual war of the Roman Catholic Church for the conversion of Protestants; and it is now general.

The war against Protestantism is very clear in Europe; the doctrines of Protestantism and the ministrations of Protestantism are everywhere persecuted—in Austria, and expelled from Hungary—they were persecuted and expelled from France. Many thousand Protestants were expelled from the French schools, to please the new jesuitical French Government; and now, under the present government, many, especially the preachers, are expelled. Now, the war is commencing in Prussia, the best Protestant government on the continent, but in which the Jesuits now begin to predominate.

The first work of the Jesuits in Prussia, was to disturb the Protestants in their faith. I gave you an example of this war in Italy, in what I said about the Madii. I will only add to this another little detail. We have in Florence a young man of the name of ———, who is probably condemned to two or three years' imprisonment without any trial, and only for having in his possession the Bible, and for having read it habitually. So the struggle against Protestantism, and the opposition to its being introduced, are very great.

Now, do you know anything about the war in America against Protestantism? It is not very difficult for Protestants to meet it. And yet I see that the Roman Catholic hierarchy exercises a very great influence over the minds of a great many Protestants. The war waged by the Roman Catholic clergy in America consists chiefly of two or three capital points. The first point is to overwhelm all enemies with ignominy. I have before observed, that when a Protestant is converted to Romanism, the Protestants notice this conversion once or twice in the papers; it is talked of for a day or two, and then the subject is dropped, and never more spoken of.

Some time ago, when the American Bishop Ives became a Romanist, the only thing said was, that he was a foolish little fellow, and nothing more.

The Protestants have no need to attack the private character of those Protestants who have become Romanists; but such is not the case with Catholics. If a Catholic becomes a Protestant, the Catholics persecute him, and the persecution never ceases while this man lives; and it is not only a persecution against his new doctrines and preachings, but also against his private character; and from anonymous attacks we are led to evil conjectures about this man—a man whose character is lost; and by insinuations they contrive to cover with ignominy their victims.

Is not this a persecution? because in this way they annihilate and destroy this man who speaks practically against the system which they abandoned. Another of the points by which they wage war against Protestantism, is to denounce all free discussion. Mark, my dear brethren, when a priest speaks against

Protestants, the Romanists say, he is right, and is making use of his rights; but when a Protestant speaks against a Papist. Oh! oh! Then you hear everywhere the exclamation, "this is a Protestant crusade against Papists. Oh! don't do that, you will excite citizen against citizen. Oh! oh! this is a war carried on by the Americans against their Catholic brethren!"*

Alas! alas! do you know the jesuitical manner in which they wage war with sneers, saying it is necessary to put him down? Oh, this man, let us crush him before he speaks; oh, really the appearance of this man will be a dreadful event; oh, go, go from America, and leave us to our slumbers!

When John of New York spoke of the decline of Protestantism, oh, he, of course, was right. It is all proper for John to speak of the decline of Protestantism; but what is the cause of the decline of Protestantism? It is owing to the war waged by Popery. Protestantism cannot decline without Popery being the cause; therefore you have cross John, who speaks against the decline of Protestantism, and you have many ministers and many laymen among Protestants, who speak of the increase of Popery.

Was John right when he spoke of the decline of Protestantism? and are the Protestant ministers right when they speak about the spreading of Popery? Oh no, certainly; and therefore it is necessary to stop their mouths while we can. The last capital point of the Papists, by which to wage war against Protestants, is to insult and defy public opinion.

My dear brethren, there is a proverb which says, that if you are timid you will be trodden down—if you are fearless you will stand in safety and security.

Such are the maxims of the Popish clergy. They brave the Protestant opinion—they curse its practices; but they themselves put into practice what they before cursed.

Allow me to repeat, with some addition, what I said about the Archbishop of Bogota; for this morning I read the account of the second meeting assembled to present to this reverend

* The Father was supposed to allude here to an article in the "Tribune," against Father Achilli.

gentleman an elegant and costly ring. Oh! oh! we are in a free land—in America. But I ask, what right has Archbishop Hughes to calumniate the Protestants, and to cover them with ignominy for their meeting in Metropolitan Hall in behalf of the Madiai, when he, in this same Metropolitan Hall, had a meeting for the Archbishop of Bogota?

Now let us sympathize with this victim of the government of New Grenada, as the Protestants sympathized with the poor of the government of Tuscany.

Is it the same thing? No! The Archbishop said a blow was given to the Tuscan government in the meeting in Metropolitan Hall. If so, a blow was also given to the New Grenadian government by the Catholic meeting in Metropolitan Hall. Moreover, and finally, the meeting in favor of the Madiai was called in favor of two innocent and powerless victims, who, as is allowed even in the prosecution, never disturbed the peace of Tuscany.

But the Archbishop of Bogota really tried to disturb the peace and concord of New Grenada, to excite its subjects against the government.

An Archbishop tried in Italy to excite the Piedmontese against the government; therefore, if you will honor such a man, and if you will be guaranteed such a right yourself, allow every one else the same freedom; let all pay honor to those to whom they think honor is due, and don't find fault with the Madiai meeting in Metropolitan Hall, when you follow it with just such a meeting for the Archbishop of Bogota!

This, however, is just the plan the Roman Catholic clergy take in America, and everywhere, to obtain and to maintain their domination.

The Roman Catholic church has many other means of waging war with effect. One of these is their nunneries, which are transplanted from Europe to America.

The Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of Charity, belonging to the Society of Jesus, have a secret mission to overthrow Protestantism everywhere, as rapidly and as effectually as they can. But the captains of that army—and a charming army it is, too

—are the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Oh, the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus! I respect the ladies. I would lie down in the dust for the ladies—but not for the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus—because I know from the gospel that His heart had no ladies at all. I don't recognise the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; but in them I recognise the best soldiers of Papacy in the world against Protestantism in America.

Why do the Americans like the ladies of the Sacred Heart so much? Why, they are ladies of high rank; they are princesses, marchionesses, countesses, baronesses, and so on. You, republicans, you like princesses, marchionesses, etc.? Oh no, no! This is a very new kind of republicanism to me; especially to-day, when you call yourselves a democratic republic. This is a little inconsistent, but it is of no moment.

What good do the ladies of the Sacred Heart accomplish in America? First rate education. Don't answer me first rate education, but answer me first rate Protestant education. Can you answer me that the ladies of the Sacred Heart impart sound Protestant education? No!

But they teach the French language very well. That is a capital thing; but are you bound to teach your daughters a foreign language, or the language of the gospel? This is what you ought to think of, Protestant fathers and mothers.

When they have learned the French language in this school, they will read very badly the Protestant prayer-book.

But amongst these young girls every kind of religious discussion is forbidden; therefore there can be no danger for Protestant girls. Oh, you are mistaken! You believe, blindly and kindly, that in the Sacred Heart of Jesus there are no religious discussions allowed. You will permit me to say that that is overdoing the usual simplicity of the Yankee. No! no! But they really cannot discuss, and do not discuss.

Do you know why? Because Jesuits and ladies of the Sacred Heart fear the consequences of such discussion; because a little Protestant girl, Bible in hand, can confound not only all her companions, but also, in many instances, her teachers; and therefore it is, that discussion is forbidden, for fear that the Ro-

man Catholic girls in discussion with Protestant girls become themselves Protestants; and, therefore, this is why discussion is forbidden, because for them it would operate the wrong way altogether, so you that patronize these people see that you have your daughters always in the hands of the devil—very charming devils—but still they are the hands of the devil!

When a daughter of the Philistines tempted the Israelites to sacrifice to Baal they were vanquished, after they had made unto themselves an image.

In the convent of the Sacred Heart are used all sorts of fascinations. The vanity of the young girls is tampered with; they flatter their young Protestant pupils; they are always preferred in everything; they are pardoned for their faults, in order to gain their hearts. In many instances in Paris, English Protestant girls become Romanist through the seductive manners of their individual teachers; therefore your daughters are in danger of falling from their faith, when among the ladies of the Sacred Heart.

Do you believe that Romanists, especially monks, and particularly nuns, among the Jesuits, can educate Protestants for Protestantism? Oh, blind Protestants! the parallel argument exists in Switzerland. In the Jesuitical college of Fribourg, Roman Catholics and Protestants were educated together, but only to make proselytes among Protestants, and to convert pupils to the Roman Catholic faith. This is the case in your country also; and though I do not wish to throw discredit on the Sacred Heart, yet I think you will find that many of your daughters, brought up in the conduct of the Sacred Hearts, will become Catholics.

When they leave the college they swear to be silent on their conversion, and to keep on with the Protestants until the day comes when they can publicly avow their faith. And this is no new practice—to be outwardly a Protestant, whilst inwardly a Catholic!

I am insisting on this point, because no later than this morning I read in a very good Protestant newspaper, viz., the *Express*, that the "Freeman's Journal" states that all your public schools

are either Protestant or infidel. Now, what do you say about their schools? They are schools of monks and Jesuits, but are they Protestant schools likewise? No! they are Papist, to educate people in Popish practices! Remember, if the Jesuits succeed in subverting some of the best families in America, they will, in a few years, become dominant in America; therefore it is that I insist on my point for this, the great beginning of the terrible war against Protestantism.

Society, to a great extent, is influenced by the higher class, therefore do the Jesuits strive to get into these higher classes, and do now speak to some somnolent and indifferent Americans, who will say, we desire only a good education, dancing, music, singing, and French—these are all we seek. Yes, is this all? Oh, what sort of honor and reputation will your daughters bring to your families with dancing and song? No very enviable one. But with the true knowledge of Christianity and sound learning, they will cover you with honor.

I won't stop to say much to some great politicians, who send their daughters to Roman Catholic schools, in order to obtain the approbation of Bishop Hughes; it is to secure also the votes of Bishop Hughes and his party. But I must say a few words to some Roman Catholic parents, who are quite blind on this point, being ignorant of the dangers which surround their daughters in the establishments of the Sacred Heart.

Take away your girls from the Sacred Heart, for they will return to your homes speaking the French language, perhaps, but they will know nothing consistent with a good Protestant education; and if you wish them to have a good French education, you are sufficiently cosmopolite in your cities to obtain foreign instruction. You have all kinds of speculation, why do you not make a speculation for a good education? Why have you not in your country some French ladies from Paris or Savoy, as we have in Italy? They can impart a first rate education, but without the danger of imparting Catholicism also.

Now the ladies of the Sacred Heart are dreadfully exciting for the Protestant American ladies, because they are so refined, and this over-refinement overawes the simple American people.

The ladies of the Sacred Heart are supported and seconded by the Jesuits and the Father Confessors; and, moreover, the education they impart is bad, because inspired from jesuitical sources. Now, I will not repeat what I said in another lecture, that since Jesuits are not transubstantiated into Americans when they land on your shores, they will ruin America at last, as they ruined the continent of Europe and Central America. I bid you therefore beware. The Jesuits are sometimes secret and sometimes open in their proceedings. I speak especially of their hatred against your National and Republican Schools.

My dear brethren, when I witnessed in Ireland the indignation of the Jesuits against the Queen's colleges, I was not astonished to find the Jesuits so madly opposed to your National Schools.

I received this morning an article from the *Tablet* (a counterpart of the same paper in Ireland); it is the best specimen of intolerance in this country, as the *Tablet* in Dublin is there.

In this *Tablet* there is a very long article in opposition to the National Schools. They are all put under a ban by the hierarchy of the United States, because they do not agree with the teachings of St. Peter, who spoke clearly against the National Schools—so they say!—so that St. Peter, who strove to enlighten all mankind, is quoted as the advocate of ignorance among the people! Read this article, and you will find the opinions of the Papists concerning the National Schools set forth, for once, openly to the public. In this one instance they wage war openly. They say they are schools of the devil, and therefore, they say that it is better for children to be mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, than to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic in these schools of the devil. They desire America to have a population of ignorant, blind people, because such people will allow themselves to be enslaved by the Church of Rome. It was while carrying on this war openly about the schools in Cincinnati, that the Jesuits met with such a failure there and in Baltimore. In New York they will also fail, on the same point, if they attempt to war here; and, in order to get up some preliminary indignation, they write articles

like this I allude to. They maintain that they have as good a right to desire all to remove their children from the National Schools, in the same manner that you think it right to preach the removing of your daughters from the Sacred Heart.

My dear brethren, the two cases are quite different. Their convents are surrounded by darkness and mystery, but in your National Schools the wisdom of American legislators has devoted the greatest attention and care to avoid offending in anything, especially the conscience of the Roman Catholics; it is, therefore, an insult when they say it is better to remain in ignorance than to send their children to your National Schools. So much for the Jesuits of this country and their policy, tending to destroy your freedom.

But crafty and untiring as they are, I do not so much fear the Jesuits from Europe as I fear the American Jesuits. I do not fear the Roman Catholic Jesuits as I fear the Protestant Jesuits. I do not fear so much the Jesuits of Rome as I do the Jesuits of Oxford in England. I do not fear so much the followers of Ignatius as I do the followers of Dr. Pusey!

Who is Dr. Pusey, ask some, and what is Puseyism? It is the Church of Rome with a Protestant mask, and Dr. Pusey is a very learned man, one of the highest professors of the University of Oxford. Outside he has the Oxonian toga—all right outside! Wonderful! Inside, ugh! If Dr. Pusey will throw open his Oxonian toga you will see hissing snakes, prepared to spread their venom over all the Protestant world! Oh! to all appearances he is Protestant—in intolerance he is Romanist. The chapel of Dr. Pusey professes to be a Protestant chapel, but it has a Popish altar; a Protestant pulpit with Papist sermons; a Protestant Bible with Papist maxims; it has Papist candlesticks, Papist incense, Papist genuflexions, Papist holy water—all, all Popish—excepting in name, honor, position in society, and money!

Shame, shame on a man, shame on a congregation, which thinks one thing and practises another! Come before me as Romanists and I will respect your Popish faith; but come in appearance Protestant but in heart Romanist, no, no! it is a diabolical way.

All one thing or all the other, and no half-and-half. Such a religion is no religion at all. I am severe and precise upon this point, because I know Puseyism in a Protestant country is the noviciate for the Church of Rome, my dear brethren. To apostatize Protestantism openly, is found to be too difficult a task; therefore the Jesuits operate secretly, by means of Puseyism, in order to prepare the way for the full and final adoption of Catholicism; and as my mission, under the blessing of God, is to destroy Pope and Popery in my dear country, and, if possible, everywhere, so my mission in England and in all other Protestant countries is to destroy that which looks to me so very like Pope and Popery; my mission, therefore, is to nip it in the bud, to preach independently, as an independent man, against Puseyism, for it is the first step towards the Popish Church. In this struggle it is necessary to avoid the very beginnings. Remember that the devil has always been very cunning. It is a very ungallant proposition, but true, and real Protestants will allow it to be true—the devil and women are leagued together in this new presentation of Protestantism! When the devil tempted Eve, he did not dare to tempt our great mother except in a very covert manner; he did not dare to appear as the devil, with two horns, a long tail, claws, and cloven feet. Oh, no! he came in the shape of a beautiful serpent, and Eve was fascinated by its appearance, so she ate the apple; and poor Adam was tempted in his turn, and in this way sin entered the world. This is the policy now in the Roman Catholic church, with regard to the Protestants. The Roman Catholic church personifies the devil, and is now transubstantiated into Puseyism. He don't appear in his Roman Catholic character; no, he conceals himself under a specious appearance—white dresses, genuflexions, fine ceremonies, flowers, perfumes, incense, music, and silver and gold plate. All people like this grand display, it is better than the black dresses of the Protestants, and so they go to the Puseyite congregation; and husbands and fathers, in order to please their wives and daughters, go to the Puseyite chapel—especially, all the higher class go there. This is the way to introduce Popery among Protestants.

The tempting devil is Dr. Pusey, and women support Dr. Pusey. But Puseyism is really an exotic, though a flower; this flower is one of a great family, botanically speaking. This family is called Tractarianism, therefore Tractarianism is the father of Puseyism; Puseyism is the brother of Jesuitism, and Jesuitism is the serpent.

Puseyitesses are the serpentesses, and between the serpents and serpentesses they produce a species of mongrel Protestantism.

My dear brethren, tractarianism was a good thing when it was kept between bounds and limits, but when it came to be without limits it became as bad as Popery and Papacy. I speak now from experience, and I know that the best supporters in England of Popery and of Pius IX. were not exclusively Wiseman, Newman, Kyle, Wilberforce, Lucas, and so on. No; one of the best supporters of Pius IX., one of the greatest allies of Popery, especially in the time of the Papal aggression in England, was the Protestant Bishop of Exeter, because he was a tractarian bishop; therefore, Popes and Popery are fond of tractarians; therefore I speak loudly against tractarianism in England and in America—if, indeed, any has entered into America—because it is more to be dreaded than Puseyism, as an ally of the Roman Catholic church.

Under this title of tractarianism you find many dogmas, sometimes a little Romanism, sometimes a little Puseyism, mixed with a little Protestantism. Every day, in fact, some fresh phase is discovered, together with various accounts of this bishop or that layman becoming Roman Catholics, etc. My astonishment would be, that all Puseyites are not Roman Catholics at once, did I not know that it is their policy to wait a few years, in order to come out with more eclat. Therefore, beware of tractarianism; and if you find people saying we are rooted in our faith, with our prayer-books and sermons, oh, watch narrowly that you do nothing beyond to impair this confident faith.

I was living in London between two tractarian fires—namely, between the Protestant clergyman of Portland street, and a Puseyite chapel; the former, in a few months, tried to induce

his curates to become Roman Catholic priests, and in a few months you could scarcely call this a Protestant parish or a Protestant priest. He was a tractarian. But I may be answered, if he tried to make his curates Catholics, though nominally a tractarian, he was in fact a Roman Catholic.

The parish priest of the Puseyite chapel introduced all kinds of Popish worship, and when reproved by the Church, he said, the Roman Catholics used such beautiful things, why should the Protestants deprive themselves of such attractions to entice people to church? My answer is, they need them because the Catholic is a Pagan church—the Protestants need them not, because it is a Christian church.

I will now suggest something to the Protestants of America. Remember that St. Paul said, a little leaven can corrupt the whole mass; therefore, if what these people say is true, that they are accommodating their ceremonies and litanies to Romanism, I ask you, Protestants, I implore you, to watch and examine your prayer-books, and if you find in them anything in name or in practice similar to the Church of Rome, take it away and correct your prayer-books; because this is the little leaven which will corrupt the whole Protestant faith. As I am acquainted with the Roman Catholic liturgy and nomenclature, if you have a period of the year called Lent, if you have visiting days, the offices of the apostles, the names of saints, St. Dunstan, St. Patrick, St. Denis, and so on; if you have Candlemas Day, Michaelmas Day, if you have some of the Roman ceremonies, such as confirmation, fasting, &c.; I say, Protestants, it is better to change these names and to correct this prayer-book, and thus maintain the Protestant religion in its original purity of faith. It is better to do this than to incur the danger and peril of losing the Protestant faith, by introducing among the Protestants liturgies and practices adopted only by the Romanists. No, no! Remember this great and glorious maxim—the Protestant faith, without liturgies or ceremonies. Nothing of that kind. The Protestant faith is the Gospel of Christ, and the faith of Christ.

Purify its faith, without introducing, as in England, Roman practices and ceremonies, and saying that they are according to

the Protestant prayer-books, and its liturgies according to the Diocese of Exeter.

Christ said, in the Gospel, we have not received a spirit of slavery but a spirit of freedom; and, therefore, Baptists, Friends' society, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, all may say abba, Father; but Puseyites and Tractarians cannot justly say so, because they are followers of the Exeter Bishop, and not, either in spirit or truth, Protestants.

Now, if these people are secret allies of Rome in the war against Protestantism, in this last portion of my lecture, I will say something about some other Protestants who aid in the war against the Protestant community at large. I discovered immediately on my arrival here, that the greatest aids to the Roman Catholics among the Protestants were the politicians and the press, some of them, I mean; but remember what I said in my first course of lectures about your National Schools. Some morbid Protestants, in order to please the Romanists, and in order not to exclude the Roman Catholic children, forbid the reading of the Bible in the schools. Protestants, what are you without the Bible? Nothing more nor less than Papists, because they are without the Bible. If, then, you exclude the Bible, you will convert your National Schools into Roman Catholic Papist Schools. No! no! Prove to me that the Bible is a bad, an indecent book, that it corrupts the heart and mind of youth, and I will coincide with you that it should be excluded from the National Schools; knowing, however, as I do, that the Bible alone can produce a free people, oh! do not exclude the Bible from your National Schools!

Remember, that even should the Romanists say, if you have the Bible read in your schools, we cannot send them there, it is you, then, who wage openly and fearlessly the war with Archbishop Hughes, and the Jesuits, and all the Popish leaders. Then they will change their policy, and try to prove the corruption of the Protestant Bible. Then, you will meet together to correct the translation according to the best original text; and then you can say to the Papists—you cannot now exclude the Bible if you are a Christian people; and in this way you will

trample over all difficulties. People say that when we preach so loudly against Roman Catholic pretensions in this country, we are engaging in a crusade against the Roman Catholics. No! no! Hear me; if twenty or thirty years ago some people, and among them myself, for instance, had come into America, preaching against the Roman Catholic system as I am preaching to-day, it would then have been imputed to me as a crime, because then the Papists in your country were quiet, were only native Americans; and, therefore, it would have been a crime to excite war between native Americans and native Americans. But, now, after so many hundred Jesuits have come to America from Europe; now, after so many hundred thousand Roman Catholics have emigrated to this country, to be silent on the Popish system is no longer a duty, indeed, it is a crime.

The number of the Jesuits should have been put down in your last census, where you have numbered all your people. Between the years 1830 and 1843, you have an increase of nearly four hundred priests; and during the last ten years you have an increase of not less than eight hundred priests and fifteen bishops.

If you go on in the same proportion in America, you will, in ten more years, have not less than ten thousand Jesuits, and ten millions of Catholics.

Then all these people having votes, the Protestant politicians will have very little chance of ever obtaining the supremacy, and the influences will be all Catholic.

Alas! alas! for America, when the Roman Catholic population shall overbalance the Protestant and native Americans; for then, in the legislative bodies of America, the Roman Catholics will rise, as they have risen in England, and as they are now arising in Prussia, to immense power, and they will use that power to the destruction of all religious freedom.

Alas! for all your dreams of the future development and greatness of the United States, and the annexation of neighboring Roman Catholic territory. When the Legislature of this country shall be thus overpowered by Catholicism, then will commence the decline of your Protestant American Republic.

Tolerance! tolerance!! Oh! be tolerant, say some good,

quiet people, who belong more especially to the Oxford species of Protestantism; we are all sister churches. Tolerance, that is a very great Christian virtue. I have myself preached tolerance in my own country, but I would have tolerance on both sides; and when I find Protestants all tolerant, and the Roman Catholics all intolerant, it is madness to preach tolerance, in order to be devoured.

I am the first to advocate tolerance, but it must be reciprocal tolerance. Were you to see a madman rushing against you and yours, sword in hand, would you for the sake of being tolerant open your breast to receive the blow, and allow your children to be murdered for the same motive? No. The best way is to keep this man in a lunatic asylum to recover his lost mind. The Roman Catholic system will come to you with an unsheathed sword, will you then present your Protestant bosoms to receive its blow? if you do you will be the first victims, and sacrifice for ever the freedom of your children.

The reason the Romanists are so strong is, that they are so united. We, in Italy, in the time of our crusade lost our independence, because our forces were too much divided. Protestants, work together against the common enemy! Union, Protestants; not a nominal union, but real true union of all congregations, of all religious opinions; union, union!

Then you will see Pope and Popery fall in your country; and your American flag will be always glorious, always the standard of freedom, and the refuge and home for all the exiles of European lands of despotism, and from even the very name of Popery.

PUBLIC DEMONSTRATION
AT
Metropolitan Hall.

TESTIMONIAL TO FATHER GAVAZZI
AND
GAVAZZI'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

DURING the course of the preceding Lectures, several consultations were held among some friends of the cause to which they were devoted, and it was determined that the Father could not be permitted to leave the city without some testimonial of the interest his visit had excited, and the profound satisfaction derived from his Lectures. The result of these deliberations was, that on Friday evening, 18th May, an immense assemblage of the citizens of New York congregated in Metropolitan Hall to present a testimonial to Father Gavazzi. The ladies attended in the proportion of ten to one; and, as the body of the hall and the galleries were well filled, the scene was very brilliant. Doctor Ferris, of New York, presided, and the proscenium was filled with clergymen. The Chairman came forward, and addressed the audience as follows:—

“ ‘Honor to whom honor is due,’ is a maxim belonging as much to Christianity as to common righteousness.

“ American Protestants are engaged in a work of incalculable moment to our country and our common Christianity. We believe in our inmost hearts, that the Papal system is equally the foe of civil and religious freedom. We believe that we can alone perpetuate our noble institutions, and the inheritance bequeathed

by our fathers, by maintaining a free conscience and a free gospel. We feel that our struggle is for all that should be dear to us, all that is hallowed by these sacrifices which our freedom cost. The signs of the times are portentous of great and solemn events of evil, if we are careless—good, if we are vigilant.

“While thus engaged, a distinguished stranger comes among us. He comes as a witness, emancipated from the very thralldom which we seek to avoid; he throws the whole weight of his character and his eloquence into our scale; he speaks with the earnestness of deep conviction; he has done a good work; he has confirmed all that we have urged against Rome; he has shed new additional lights on the questions involved; he has performed vast labors.

“Now it is befitting that we, to whom he has been a co-laborer, should give him some suitable expression of our regard, and our sense of his services. This is the object of this meeting. Honor to whom honor is due.” (*Applause.*)

After prayer by Rev. Mr. Hutton, Dr. Cox came forward to present the testimonial. He (Dr. Cox) proceeded then to say:

“Mr. Chairman, and my respected and honored friends, you could not easily lose the impression obtained some four months since in a meeting, presided over by your Mayor before he had been a week in office, and where I had the honor of addressing a large audience, all sympathizing with those poor people, less the victims of the Duke of Tuscany than of the Jesuits. In the Tabernacle, seven weeks ago last Wednesday, I had the honor of uttering the welcome of America to the Italian Gavazzi. Proceeding upon documents most authentic, and signed by names that conciliated the confidence of both sides of the Atlantic, I felt that I was hazarding nothing in anticipating for that stranger the very high congratulation and deep-toned confidence of applause with which, in joy and grief, we, in this numerous assembly, bid him farewell to-night.

“On that first occasion I felt the honor deeply; but how much more should I have felt it had I known, as I afterwards did, that Archbishop Hughes was present, in disguise. We have no more ill-will towards Mr. John, than Gavazzi himself. Instead of

envying him, I wish he knew one thousandth part of the responsibility for eternity, if not for time, that rests upon him. We are sorry, indeed, that such a stranger, with a right to the succession of St. Peter, as himself, with all the quips and quizms of the Italian language at the end of his tongue, should have been overlooked. It is strange that hospitality, if nothing else, should not have brought him here to give to this stranger the right-hand of fellowship, in order to show how entirely he is a friend to universal liberty. But then, as an American myself, I recollect that some foreign officials—some known and some unknown—cannot be naturalized, because, to swear allegiance to this government, they must forswear their allegiance to the greatest despot in the world!

“For reasons which I cannot think myself bound to analyze, or even to understand, I have been, almost at the going down of the sun, arrested by some zealous bailiff and brought here to perform this service, and have thought it best, on the whole, to give up another duty, possibly not quite so imperious and important, to speak for these honored brethren, whose names I will read at the end of this document.

“My honored friends:

“The occasion is a rare one in some respects; and one of which we might say—these things do not come to pass without an eternal Providence. The architect of that brother's mind and body made him as well as Martin Luther, and our prayers to God for him are, that he may prosper in all his enterprises. Some have been surprised at the type of sentiment and of religious thought, which Gavazzi has announced and enacted in this country. He says, ‘My Italy,’ so often, I am told, but not so often as Washington said, my America; I should like to gauge the dimensions through a microscope of that piety which has no patriotism with it. If he were to come here as a citizen—and he might be naturalized with a good conscience—I should not think him worthy of adoption if he could ever forget the land of his nativity. I pray those who do not think I am about to follow Bishop Ives, to suppose that I have reason with all others for thinking that Gavazzi is not less a

Christian and theologian, because, instead of waiting for Luther and Protestantism, he goes back to the thunder of the Apostle Paul.

"What do I care for Protestantism, but for the cause of Christianity, my country, and my race? We are above Protestantism, but we are Protestants, because we are Christians; and I rather congratulate the humor and wit of that instinctive Paddy, of whom a story is told by Alexander King, who, by the way, has true nobility enough to have been King Alexander:

"Pat and Barney were a-talking, and Pat said, 'I hear ye're becoming Protestant?'

"'Oh! no,' said Barney, 'I am just reading the Scriptures, and if you would know anything you should read them, too;,' 'but,' says Barney, 'did you ever see in that book anything called the epistle to the Romans?'

"'Yes,'

"'Well, did you ever hear of an epistle to the Protestants?'

"If all the world would love the epistle to the Romans, I would let Protestantism take care of itself, with earth and heaven's patronage; and I cannot but add, with Luther, that we cannot now conceive how inspiration itself could have made a document more conservative of the Primitive Church than that very epistle which was directed to them, and which it has since been the very vitals of their policy to contradict and hide away in the cobwebs of the cloister. I will not trespass upon your good humor too long. I wish to be indulged a little in the beginning, because I may be cut off at the end, to say a thing or two as an American Christian, in reference to the visit of our distinguished brother. I do not wonder he has won so many hearts. I do not wonder at the effect his visit has produced in certain quarters, where policy and Jesuit tactics have said, 'mum'—don't speak a word about the ex-monk—keep cool—the people will forget him and afterwards remember us.'

"Perhaps, 'cross John,' the people will remember you a great while. There is one thing in the visit of our brother so generic and so appropriate to this age, and to this great but perilled country, that I must state it. It is in reference to that kind of

contemptible charity not rejoicing in the truth, but rejoicing only against the truth.

"Let the men of heaven show themselves worthy of earth by loving the eternal truth, and by remembering that thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. With that view our brother has come among us, with ill-will to nobody, and with a voice like that which proclaimed at Bethlehem, 'Glory to God in the highest and on earth, peace and good will towards men'—but not peace against the truth.

"Truth and grace; truth—the grand instrument and the medium of the architect of the new creation—truth not ignorance—truth not error—God's truth, not man's invention, that is what we mean. It is our Christianity, for that we live, and, God willing it—we do not court persecution—but, by the grace of God, we are ready and able to die for the truth.

"For one, my respected countrymen, and you know that I am but a villager of Brooklyn, I congratulate myself and thank God, that the visit and the efforts of our Italian friend have found such intelligent and such mighty appreciation in this country; and not only when the Lectures have been read in New York and Brooklyn, but when they have been, with all due deference to the gentlemen who have reported them—for they cannot report the thunder and lightning—they cannot put an earthquake into types—they cannot make the compositors take the first notion of Gavazzi—yet from the Passamaquoddy to the Rio Grande, and from Canada to California, those Lectures have been read, and under all the realm of *e pluribus unum* have made millions of American hearts throb!

"I thank God for it; and, now, I ask briefly to add, before the peculiar service I stand here to perform shall arrest me and arrest you; I have a duty to perform which money cannot cancel or purchase. There is something which cannot be bought for gold.

"Can gold gain friendship? Impudence of hope!
As well mere man an angel might beget.
Love, and love only, is the loan for love.
Lorenzo, pride repress, nor hope to find
A friend, but what has found a friend in thee.
All like the purchase, few the price will pay;
And this makes friends such miracles below."

"I ask you, as Christians, so to love him, as to love the cause in which he was born, and, I trust, born again; to love him and to love Italy for what it once was, and for what, regenerated, it may yet be. I ask you to pray God for the revolution of the populated millions of that awful, wonderful, historical peninsula, and to bless God for holding him as an instrument in his right hand, that God himself may use our Gavazzi, to do that which, without God, no mortal man, no convention of seraphs, to say nothing of sages, warriors, and champions, could be equal to, or could perform.

"I ask the Christians of America to pray for that cause in which Gavazzi is a sworn crusader to the end of the war; and, if I might be allowed—and no doubt all I say, critics will catch up and find out that it is characteristic—I intend to have it characteristic—I thank God that I have character enough to have it characteristic.

"If I ever felt, Mr. Chancellor, disposed to quote Latin, I might be excused when addressing our illustrious visitor. I remember a beautiful stanza of what old Horace says to Augustus—who, great as a chieftain, and founder of the Roman empire; who is, in my own view, but a puppet and a toy, compared to this champion of the truth of God—who, posted in the fore front of the battle, nails his colors to the mast; and, as Maccabæus says to Athanasius, 'In God we trust, and in God we conquer.' I have a grand mind to translate, for the sake of the ladies, before I utter it.

"You know what transubstantiation came from. He says to Augustus, old Horace does, and in that sentence he intends to speak the spirit of his nation; and, with a little change, I think young Italy would not be misrepresented:—

"'Late, not early, may you return to heaven; a great while may you be preserved to act, prosperous, among the great people of Romulus; and may not some great and unexpected Providence remove you, justly offended at our crimes; ever in your native land, may you be spared to enjoy great triumphs here, and to be called not father only, but prince.'

"That is the prayer which the enlightened piety of Italy, and

of men now numbered by hundreds of thousands would utter for him; and, as I am sure he understands the reference, I will spare this audience the quotation of it in Latin.

"Ladies and gentlemen—I have the honor to read to you what six or seven hundred friends have put into my hands—putting at the same time something very sincerely into his—something that comes first from their hearts and then from their purses."

Dr. Cox then read the following Address, interlarding it with appropriate commentaries:—

"PADEE ALEXANDRE GAVAZZI:—As friends of your cause, your country, and yourself personally, we present to you this slight testimonial of our regard. The offering enclosed (one thousand dollars) is but just sufficient to give you, for your last course of Lectures, the freedom of the hall. Appropriately, it should have preceded your labors; but now, perhaps, still more appropriately, as the testimony of our admiration and confidence, it closes them. We wish publicly thus to express our approbation of your efforts, and our consideration of the great good which, by the blessing of God, must result therefrom.

"You have succeeded, on a subject of vast importance and difficulty, surrounded with prejudice and odium, in mingling instruction, information, argument, scriptural and historical truth, personal knowledge and experience, wit, sarcasm, humor, earnest feeling, and powerful eloquence, in such a manner as to win the admiration and awaken the interest of multitudes who have heard you, and multitudes more who have only read the brief reports of your Lectures in the daily papers. We rejoice in your devoted patriotism, your ardent love of liberty, your abhorrence of the Papal despotism, your acquaintance with divine truth, your love of the Bible and your reliance upon it, your perfect frankness, fearlessness, and independence. May God guide you, instruct your own heart more and more in his truth, baptize you with his spirit, prepare you to preach the gospel of Christ in your own dear Italy, and make you victorious, by his grace, over all enemies!

"We present you these copies of God's Word—one in our own native tongue, one in yours. [Dr. Cox kissed the books as he

handed them to Padre Gavazzi, and the audience applauded most enthusiastically.] In the conflict against the Papal system, as against every part of the kingdom of Satan, the Bible is the foundation of all our hopes, the source of all our strength, the storehouse of our weapons. The Bible in our hearts and lives, the Bible in all our institutions, the Bible at our fireside, in our sanctuaries and our schools, the Bible as free as the air, and as all-surrounding, the Bible, here, there, everywhere, is the support and the safeguard of our civil and religious liberties, and the only sure ground of national and personal prosperity. May the Word of God fill your own dear native Italy; may it prevail in all your families, your churches, your schools; may it speedily have free course and be glorified everywhere, with you as with us, and may your dear native land be free with the liberty of Christian freemen, by the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus! And God grant that you yourself may be spared to witness the beginning of this day of glory!

"In behalf of your hearers and friends, who have, with warm hearts, united in this testimonial, we are most respectfully and truly yours,

"GEORGE B. CHEEVER,
 "GEORGE DOUGLAS,
 "C. R. ROBERT,
 "ANSON J. PHELPS,
 "JAMES A. DWIGHT,
 "MORTIMER DE MOTTE.

"New York, Friday evening, May 18, 1853."

As the Reverend Doctor read the signatures, he gave some characteristic remarks upon each, as follows:—

"These names are the representatives of more than six millions of people.

"*George B. Cheever*—I hope he will continue to be an a-chiever, as he has always been.

"*George B. Douglas*—I shall never forget the good dinner he gave me in Paris a year or two ago. I think the banquet this evening, however, far enough transcends that.

" 'Ties of time and day can sever,
But the ties of spirit never.'

"*Anson G. Phelps*—I hope he don't understand Latin. I baptize him, *Patriæ dignæ, dignus filius*.

"*James A. Dwight*—May that name, from the President of Yale College to the end of the world, be connected with pure theology.

"*Mortimer De Motte*—I know very little of this worthy brother, except that he was the bailiff who arrested me, and brought me here to-night.

"I hope the brethren will excuse me for these comments, because I am very fond of commentaries.

"I am requested to say that our friend De Motte is a native of Holland, in this country. He may be one of the men that old Amsterdam reproduced. Sir, since the old Duke of Alva sent thousands to death in the Low Countries, Protestants, neither by Spain nor Italy, could ever be exterminated from those countries which first made New York a central pole of the world, before it was New York, and for one I don't think we have gained a great deal of advantage by the change, for its present name was given in honor of that wretch, James II., Duke of York, whom England vomited out of its limits."

After Dr. Cox had retired, Padre Gavazzi came forward, and was received with enthusiastic cheering, which continued for some moments.

The applause having subsided, the Father spoke as follows:

"Some people will, perhaps, be disappointed this evening, because I have very little that is new to say, though something. But my Farewell Address must be mostly a recapitulation of all my addresses, so that I have only some corollaries, by which I shall try to prove some general propositions. Now, I come again to some general conclusions, for the benefit of your whole country; and first, I am very glad to look back to my first address in New York; certainly, my first appearance was, for some people, rather dreadful.

"I announced myself as a man of war, therefore the peacefully inclined disclaimed my appearance in America; but now, after

two months and a half sojourn among you, I repeat, gladly, that my mission in America is a mission of war, and I shall maintain war! My mission is for war, and shall be war—war against the dignitaries, war against the terrors, war against the superstitions of the Papist system! War! war! for ever, my dear brethren.

“Now, when I have declared war and maintain war, I am glad to find that it is the only element to preserve free America. This is what is necessary in America, in order to balance and to maintain an equilibrium between Papists and Protestants. Do not mistake things in America. When I arrived, the prevalence of power and opinion was for the Papists; the Papists were free to speak against Protestants, but the Protestants were not at liberty to speak against Papists; therefore, it was necessary to interpose a war in order to recover a balance. Yes, in America, there was freedom to speak against Protestants, but let us also have freedom for Protestants to speak against the Popish system. It is also necessary to maintain the purity of Protestantism. In order to maintain the purity of the air, it is sometimes necessary to have fresh breezes; in order to maintain the purity of water it is necessary to have strong gales; and in order to maintain the purity of Protestantism, it is necessary to have fresh and ever-renewed discussion. Without discussion Protestantism becomes dull and damp; therefore it is necessary to renew, from time to time, a discussion about Protestant matters, and especially to preserve Protestants from the errors of Popery.

“My dear brethren, remember what Christ said in the gospel, when the father of a family was asleep the enemy of man came to sow over the good field bad tares. When you sleep, when you rest peaceably over your American laurels, the Jesuits, bishops, and archbishops, work and sow tares in the Protestant field, my dear brethren; and therefore, war, war, to excite the eradication of these weeds; and, finally, war to cut off the rising influence of Popedom and Popery in this country.

“My dear brethren, remember what I have said in all my Lectures, I have nothing against individuals, I have always respected them; and, moreover, in my dear country I respect all religious

opinions, but I cannot respect the system. When I find a bad system, it is my duty to speak against that system, in order to enlighten the Papists, and induce them to embrace the purity of the Christian faith, as it exists among Protestants; and therefore war, in order to prevent the increase of Papist influence in your America.

"Oh, America! you are no more to-day as you were in 1820 or 1830. Day after day and year after year the Roman Catholic population increases in your country; and what is worse, the Jesuits increase in your country; Roman Catholic prelates increase, and even apparent Protestants, with Catholic views and principles at heart. Therefore, I repeat, that if twenty years ago it was a crime to speak against Popery, to-day it is a crime to be silent on Popery. It is your duty, Americans, to look about you to discover the arts of the Papists, employed to overthrow your religious and civil liberty; therefore war, always war, and everywhere war, in your America, by myself will I proclaim!

"Now, I say, yes, give leave to all who choose to land on your hospitable shore. May America ever be the hospitable refuge of all Europe, as it now is; and also let the Roman Catholic be free in his worship in America. Yes, but if they are free in this country, may America never become a Roman Catholic country.

"Let it be different from my dear country; let there be free land, free government, but no Roman Catholic government! Never, never! This is the first corollary; namely, the necessity of maintaining an evangelical war in your country.

"The second corollary is—

"It is necessary to maintain your nationality, especially in your schools. I am glad to be among the champions of your National Schools. I know the great care and art of the Jesuits on this point. They wish to transubstantiate your National Schools; but it is in your power, my brethren, to prevent such an extraordinary mutilation of your schools. No transubstantiation in your schools! You should, therefore, maintain their nationality. You may be proud of the name of Ameri-

cans, and may you never change this glorious name on account of any Jesuits. No, we exiles, we emigrants, are proud of being Americans in America. Therefore, don't change your name for any Italian name, French name, Irish name, or any other name.

"American schools! American, and nothing else! and they shall be American schools while they remain Protestant schools. Whenever this name shall be changed into a Papist name, you will never more have even Popish schools in your country. Oh I have dreamed of this at once little and numerous army of good American boys—I dreamed it sometimes—and when, on the other hand, I see the monstrous dragon coming with open mouth from Rome, against your America—I dream sometimes of seeing this little army of Protestants, Bible in hand, marching forth against these Romish dragons!

"We agree, then, on this point. We agree, then, that the name of National American School is all that Americans can expect from these schools. Oh, my dear brethren, educate your young people in Protestant learning; prevent your boys from being scandals and disgraces, and you will have stonger native Americans in future. Moreover, educate your children in the glorious duties of an American citizen; especially, inculcate in them the freedom of voting at your elections according to their conscience, their opinion, and for the benefit of their native country, and not to vote for bishops, archbishops, or father confessors!

"Now, as an appendix to this second corollary, I recommend you to watch the jesuitical movement in your country; and if it is impossible, according to your Constitution, to expel from America the foreign Jesuits and prelates coming in so rapidly from Rome, watch, Americans, watch, in order to prevent mobs, riots, and discords, which they promote and encourage, as they did last year in England.

"Now, I am about to speak of some new matters. I was misrepresented of having accused the President of having made choice of a Roman Catholic to fill a high office in his Cabinet. I don't speak of any individual, when I say, take care that some

public offices are not occupied by Romanists. I don't speak now about magistrates. I remember, in a very large town in Yorkshire, a Roman Catholic magistrate. To choose Catholic magistrates is well enough, especially for Roman Catholic functions; but don't give them any high offices, because, in a Protestant country, the strength of the government should be in Protestant hands. Now, what I have to say is against the advisability of having Roman Catholics employed in the post-office, in the law departments, or in any high places. No, no! Give them posts of honor, give what you please to Roman Catholics, but don't give them places of power, and especially, don't give them any place in the post-office. Never, never! Don't say it is not my business to enter into a discussion of American affairs. No, I respect the laws of your country. I speak of the system, because I know what happened in Italy on this point.

"The Jesuits in Italy, as they are now doing in England, made great efforts to get possession of all post-offices. The result was, that many letters were lost, many were opened, and before the government could receive intelligence of an event that might happen, the Jesuits had already this intelligence, and they took care to use their knowledge for their own purposes. People may say, we have here a law against opening letters; yes, but it is so easy to say this letter was lost, this letter never arrived, and the like statements—therefore, no Jesuits in the post-offices!

"This is sufficiently illustrated by history. During our war near Novara, in which the Piedmontese were defeated, and in which for a time our Italian freedom was lost, don't believe it was lost because the battle was not well fought, for only two or three Italian brigades cost the Austrians five thousand lives. What, then, was the origin of this defeat? It was the loss of a telegraphic dispatch sent from Turin to the field of battle; it was sent from a high quarter, yet it never reached its destination.

"After the loss of the battle, the matter was investigated, and it became known that the head of the chief telegraphic department was a Jesuit, whose father was a Roman prelate. That accounted for the dispatch not having been sent which lost the battle.

"No Jesuits, therefore, in the post-office, and no Roman Catholics in the post-office, if you wish to preserve the dignity, the standing, the prosperity and the liberty of your country.

"After this general manner, I come to one peculiar fact of New York, in order to open the eyes of some New Yorkers, who believe themselves secure under the shadow of the American flag. Well, it has been said to me—but, as I am not a spy, I only denounce the matter if it is true; take care if it is untrue or exaggerated.

"As I have never spoken on this point, I denounce the matter. In your New York you have an orphan asylum for poor people. When a family in the country wishes for the services of one of these children, they call on the mistress of the house and ask for a boy.

"Suppose I called for a boy. The person who called for a boy, in the first instance was questioned, 'are you Roman Catholic?' by the matron of the asylum.

"If you say, 'no,' then she will say, 'you cannot have any boy.'

"Are you in New York, my brethren? No. You are in Rome. Is this your American Protestant liberty? No. It is the liberty of the Grand Duke of Tuscany.

"You, Protestant people, pay taxes for this asylum—your Municipal Council has the surveillance of this asylum—you must think that the matron of this asylum is either a Roman Catholic or favors only Roman Catholics, when they call for a boy. Go and sleep, now.

"Now, I come directly to another point. I repeat what I said in one of my first lectures—namely, that it is not only in Russell Square, in London, where young girls are educated to be Jesuits, it is also in New York, and in America. I have, therefore, a new argument for my corollarium.

"I said, take Roman Catholic girls for your servants if you must, but watch them; generally speaking, they are rude and ignorant, but they often become gentle and refined; but don't take Roman Catholic girls educated among the Sisters of Mercy

or the Sisters of Charity, because they are fatal to your families. Remember what I said before, that those educated by the Sisters of Mercy and of Charity are very fine girls; the education is good, you cannot find anywhere else such excellent chambermaids, so diligent, so active, so practised in everything, especially in needle-work. I make my compliments to the Protestant families who enjoy such a blessing of God. But, remember, the better they are educated, the more refined they are, the more fatal are they to your children and to your families.

"You know better than I do about these things, because I am not very well acquainted with nursery matters. Your children are always with their nurses; the more kind and gentle they are, the more they are loved by your children. Well, your children having a Roman Catholic nurse, educated among nuns, seeing them morning, noon, and night, kneeling before the Virgin Mary, and often provided with beautiful images like babies, of course, curiosity and a desire of imitation in the children are excited. The young children, day after day looking at the beautiful images, and seeing the nurses kneeling and kissing the Madonnas, day after day, become acquainted with Roman Catholic practices.

"I was a teacher of a family in London where there were Roman Catholic nurses, and I was invited to look at a representation of the cradle of the Virgin Mary; and the little children were delighted with the images, so that day after day they became imbued with Roman Catholic practices.

Do you say that the servants merely follow the wishes of their masters, and that they will give Protestant educations if required to do so? No. It is always dangerous to give poison, even though you may have prepared the antidote? No. Give pure education; and, then, the antidote will only be wanting on extraordinary occasions, and so you will prepare your children for Protestantism. Remember, too, the Catholics in Protestant masks have one half, the other known as Puseyites—beautiful, beautiful!

"Forget not that the youth remembers for a long time the

teachings of his childhood ; and so, if the first example is Roman Catholic, what a dreadful future there will be for these illiterate children !

" It is said, too, that they never proselyte the children in the schools. When I was a strong and faithful Papist, in Turin, I remember a girl from a family of the Waldenses, who was employed as a chambermaid and nurse in a Roman Catholic family, and I preached against the practice of employing Protestant nurses ; and the priest, my brethren, praised my courage in daring to preach against the Protestant servants.

" I know, now, however, that the Protestants don't proselyte ; they are only in the houses as servants, and not as teachers ; but, I can maintain now, on my own knowledge, that if you think the Catholic servants do not make proselytes, you are mistaken, Americans. You think that these nuns, who are obedient to their father confessors, will not proselyte among your children ? you are greatly mistaken. Remember that the Sisters of Mercy and Charity, did not come from Europe in behalf of the American Protestant people. Oh ! no ! My dear brethren, they came from Europe in behalf of the Roman Catholics, and only in support of the Popish system ; and, never forget this point, my dear brethren : I found in America, copied into a paper of this morning, some anti-slavery remarks, from an association or union—I don't remember the name. Well!—you dare to have an anti-slavery society in your midst, in behalf of the slave, when you have domestic slaves—slaves in your homes: not negro slaves, but white slaves. You have learned, notwithstanding, that the best charity begins at home. You have anti-slavery societies? Oh ! no ! You should not have them. The best kind of charity begins at home. If you will have an anti-slavery society, all right—but you should have, beforehand, an anti-nunnery association: because these nuns who come here from Europe are here generally against their wills ; and, therefore, they are *slaves*.

" Take care of your wives, then—guard them against these influences—and after that, you may go and promote the aboli-

tion of negro slavery, with more propriety. No! I speak now, generally. Will you answer me as some Americans have done? As practical men, have you no better than these Sisters of Charity to employ as nurses? Oh no—be silent! Don't belie your facilities for obtaining the right sort of nurses. What did you do before the arrival of Sisters of Charity? Don't dishonor your American name! America don't need any Sisters of Charity for the education of her children. No! But suppose you need a better education for your children. Well—you have so many benevolent societies in your country! I find a St. Patrick's Society—with many standards, many flags, many ribbons and devices. Why have you not a benevolent society for the education of nurses and chambermaids? They are poor people, and I am very sure, need such education. So, I know you will greatly promote the cause of Christianity, if you will educate Protestant chambermaids. At any rate, I know that these others will corrupt you—these Sisters of Charity will corrupt your children. But those parents who send their daughters for education are the worst of all. Oh, that is bad! They are a dreadful importation from France. They are a Jesuitical importation to this America—these ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

“But we are told they are so fine, so high, so pious, so meek, so benevolent, that it is very ungentlemanly to speak against these ladies. I beg pardon of all champions of the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus—but it is my duty to speak against these ladies. But the more fine and beautiful they are, the more fatal they are to your society. Yes—I confess with you, they are very fascinating with your young pupils, with your daughters. They are very learned—especially in the pure French language. They are beautifully dressed, in their romantic garb; and when they walk in their park and grass, when the trees and flowers are in bloom, it is beautiful to see all their pupils, in romantic uniform, and in very romantic costume. But it is a very beautiful thing to see. Yes—but it is too beautiful, my dear brethren! because, if they are very fine and first-rate ladies,

they are also first-rate Jesuitesses, my dear brethren!—they are also first-rate Roman Catholics, oh, American people! Therefore, I say what I said in another lecture: your sons and your children will not praise you because you educated their sisters and mothers in music and the French language; but they will ask you for good Protestant education. The Roman Catholic sisters and Jesuitesses of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, cannot educate, for a good Protestant faith, your Protestant daughters. A Protestant-American mother is now in tears and despair because, a few weeks ago, her daughter became Roman Catholic, because she had been educated among these sisters. This is among the first, but it will not be the last example, if all Protestant fathers and mothers don't take care of their daughters. Take away your daughters, then, from the Sacred Heart, if you will preserve them from Catholicism. And on this point, also, if you continue to ask me, as before, "if we have no better seminary for our daughters, what are we to do?" I answer, you must be sadly troubled in order to obtain an education for your daughters! The Americans are noted for being speculators—they have in California, Mexico, Europe, and Havana—everywhere, speculation. Very well! I have nothing to say against your speculations in cotton, sugar, and wool. You speculate, too, in railways, and kill many persons: you speculate in life and fire insurances. You have first-rate hotels, which cost half a million of dollars—and yet you cannot have, in New York, very finely and beautifully situated and conducted academies for ladies, in which German professors are provided to teach German, Italian professors for Italian, French professors for the French, &c.! You cannot have such a Protestant academy? Oh, shame! If you are so good in speculating in other things, and cannot turn your attention a little to this speculation! This proposed education is not for males, but for women, and the education of your daughters should be the business of American ladies.

"I find in this America a great feminine movement. I have nothing to say against that—I respect women. You have some opponents—governesses, presidentesses!—you have some oppo-

nents, my dear sisters! But you cannot have any opponents in the field of education—because it is your exclusive ground, it is your sphere. Therefore, my dear American ladies, pardon me! I suppose the American ladies will always find some Clay, Jefferson, Webster, and even some Washington, in behalf of America: but you cannot have good Americans without the education of American ladies, my dear brethren! Defend your rights, then, in this capital point! (*Here two wreaths were thrown to the speaker.*) Do you wish to speak in public meetings? No, no! Neglect all other acquirements—the first acquirement of American ladies, is the education of American girls—especially to take away from the hands, from the beaks and talons of the ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the ladies of America. After that, the American ladies may take an opportunity to speak, and deliver their speeches. When they have provided a good education—then, go! and become Presidentesses of the United States!

“Now, in concluding practically my Address, after having given some advice to the American people—remember that I do not preach for myself, under the blessing of God! This is my heart. If I were here for a humbug! I don't dare to expose my life for a humbug! I speak for you, Americans, and for my Italy—and not for myself; and, therefore, I have a duty to perform for Americans. I was under the protection of the American flag in Rome, in the house of Mr. Freeman. I have the duty of paying for your hospitality rendered to my exiled countrymen; therefore, I have the duty to speak to you, and to warn you of your danger. And, if God blesses my mission, in my short time in America, and, if I never speak again in New York, it shall all be for my Italy. Italy seems to be dead—but she is still a living country. And, as I defended my country against the ungentle attack of the young man in England—Bailey Cochrane—I also shall try to defend her against some in America. Don't insult the oppressed people! And, remember that, from this Italy, even oppressed as she is by her despots, all that is beautiful in the art came, till to-day. Therefore, these shall be my last words.

"But, now, I rise to ask you in behalf of spiritual Italy—but, first, I must thank my friends, and beg them to excuse my broken arguments and language. The tongue is sometimes disobedient to the heart. I thank all my supporters, moral and physical, who grant to me the means of paying the expenses of this room. I thank the press, who have supported me in preaching the Word of God in their America. I thank the Roman Catholic press—because they cover me with ignominy, without answering my arguments. I thank God; if I appear in their newspapers as Satan, Belial, and Beelzebub, it will be a good thing, because it will be a guarantee to me that I am in the right way, and not a Papist. The only insult that Roman Catholic papers could put on me, would be to call me "Jesuit." Finally, I thank the Protestant press, and even those that have spoken against my mission and my Lectures. And I hope the attacks against me and my mission will produce impartiality in this Protestant press. As it has attacked me, so I hope it will attack any bishop, archbishop, or cardinal, who shall dare to attack Protestantism.

"Now, my last prayer shall be for Italy. In order to maintain the pure worship, I have commenced a church among the Italians here—if you will help me and my Italians to maintain themselves as good Christians from Rome—you will do a great good for Protestantism; because you will remember that while Italy is a Roman Catholic country, your own country will always be in danger. Therefore, in order to preserve your own liberties, it is necessary to down with Pope and Popery. The best instruments to destroy Pope and Popery, are the Italians themselves. Help us to prepare a mission in America among the Italians; and, in order to prepare it in a substantial way, a few shillings will be collected—not for me, but all of it in your hands—all for the trustees of the new building for the Italian Christian Church. May God bless all the efforts of our mission, to provide and preserve this Church! And, may God bless you, for ever and for ever!"

Dr. Ferris here rose, and said, "I have the pleasure of

announcing that a gentleman here pledges himself to give a thousand dollars towards the erection of this Church, whenever it shall be constituted on an evangelical basis."

This announcement was received with great applause, and the assemblage then dispersed.

THE END.



